

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

364 Knollcrest Drive, Suite 205, California 96002  
Phone (530) 224-4845 • Fax (530) 224-4857  
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>

**ORDER R5-2014-XXXX  
NPDES NO. CA0077704**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
CITY OF ANDERSON  
WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLANT  
SHASTA COUNTY**

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements (WDR's) set forth in this Order:

**Table 1. Discharger Information**

<b>Discharger</b>	City of Anderson
<b>Name of Facility</b>	Water Pollution Control Plant
<b>Facility Address</b>	3701 Rupert Road
	Anderson, CA 96007
	Shasta County

**Table 2. Discharge Location**

<b>Discharge Point</b>	<b>Effluent Description</b>	<b>Discharge Point Latitude (North)</b>	<b>Discharge Point Longitude (West)</b>	<b>Receiving Water</b>
001	Advanced Secondary Treated Wastewater	40° 28' 8"	122° 16' 45"	Sacramento River

**Table 3. Administrative Information**

This Order was adopted on:	<Adoption Date>
This Order shall become effective on:	<Effective Date>
This Order shall expire on:	<Expiration Date>
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge as an application for reissuance of WDR's in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, and an application for reissuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit no later than:	[Choose: <u>180 days prior to the Order expiration date</u> OR <u>&lt;insert date&gt;</u> ]
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region have classified this discharge as follows:	Major discharge

I, Pamela Creedon, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of the Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **[DATE]**.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**PAMELA C. CREEDON**, Executive Officer

## CONTENTS

I.	Facility Information .....	3
II.	Findings .....	3
III.	Discharge Prohibitions .....	4
IV.	Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications .....	4
	A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 .....	4
	1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 .....	4
	2. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable .....	6
	B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable .....	6
	C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable .....	6
V.	Receiving Water Limitations .....	6
	A. Surface Water Limitations.....	6
	B. Groundwater Limitations.....	8
VI.	Provisions .....	8
	A. Standard Provisions.....	8
	B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements.....	12
	C. Special Provisions .....	12
	1. Reopener Provisions.....	12
	2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	13
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention .....	14
	4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications.....	14
	5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) .....	15
	6. Other Special Provisions.....	18
	7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable .....	18
VII.	Compliance Determination.....	18

## TABLES

Table 1.	Discharger Information.....	1
Table 2.	Discharge Location .....	1
Table 3.	Administrative Information .....	1
Table 4.	Effluent Limitations.....	4

## ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Definitions.....	A-1
Attachment B – Map .....	B-1
Attachment C – Flow Schematic.....	C-1
Attachment D – Standard Provisions .....	D-1
Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program .....	E-1
Attachment F – Fact Sheet .....	F-1
Attachment G – Summary Of Reasonable Potential Analysis .....	G-1
Attachment H – Calculation of WQBELS .....	H-1

## I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the City of Anderson, Water Pollution Control Plant (Facility) is summarized in Table 1 and in sections I and II of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F). Section I of the Fact Sheet also includes information regarding the Facility's permit application.

## II. FINDINGS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereinafter Central Valley Water Board), finds:

- A. Legal Authorities.** This Order serves as WDR's pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters.
- B. Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Central Valley Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the application, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F), which contains background information and rationale for the requirements in this Order, is hereby incorporated into and constitutes Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G through H are also incorporated into this Order.
- C. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.B, IV.C, and V.B are included to implement state law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.
- D. Monitoring and Reporting.** 40 CFR 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and State requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment E.

The technical and monitoring reports in this Order are required in accordance with Water Code section 13267, which states the following in subsection (b)(1), *"In conducting an investigation specified in subdivision (a), the regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged discharging, or who proposes to discharge waste within its region, or any citizen or domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or discharging, or who proposes to discharge, waste outside of its region could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports."*

The Discharger owns and operates the Facility subject to this Order. The monitoring reports required by this Order are necessary to determine compliance with this Order. The need for the monitoring reports is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

- E. Notification of Interested Parties.** The Central Valley Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR's for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of the notification are provided in the Fact Sheet.
- F. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Central Valley Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order R5-2007-0167 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order. This action in no way prevents the Central Valley Water Board from taking enforcement action for past violations of the previous Order.

### III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

- A.** Discharge of wastewater from the Facility, as the Facility is specifically described in the Fact Sheet in section II.B., in a manner different from that described in this Order is prohibited.
- B.** The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).
- C.** Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in section 13050 of the Water Code.
- D.** The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the treatment or disposal system in amounts that significantly diminish the system's capability to comply with this Order. Pollutant-free wastewater means rainfall, groundwater, cooling waters, and condensates that are essentially free of pollutants.

### IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

#### A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

##### 1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E:

- a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with effluent limitations specified below:

**Table 4. Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	167	250	500	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	8.5
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	167	250	500	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Priority Pollutants						
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	14	--	28	--	--
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	29	--	43	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	28	--	54	--	--
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	125	--	179	--	--
Non-Conventional Pollutants						
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	9.0	--	22	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	150	--	370	--	--
Nitrate Plus Nitrite	mg/L	40	--	--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Based on an average dry weather flow of 2.0 million gallons per day (MGD).

- b. **Percent Removal:** The average monthly percent removal of 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>) and total suspended solids (TSS) shall not be less than 85 percent.
- c. **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:
  - i. 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and
  - ii. 90%, median for any three consecutive bioassays.
- d. **Total Residual Chlorine.** Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:
  - i. 0.011 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and
  - ii. 0.019 mg/L, as a 1-hour average.
- e. **Total Coliform Organisms.** Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed:
  - i. 23 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median;
  - ii. 240 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and
  - iii. 500 MPN/100 mL, at any time.
- f. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 2.0 MGD.
- g. **Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon.** Effluent chlorpyrifos and diazinon concentrations shall not exceed the sum of one (1.0) as defined below:
  - i. **Average Monthly Effluent Limitation**

$$S_{avg} = \frac{C_{D\ avg}}{0.079} + \frac{C_{C\ avg}}{0.012} \leq 1.0$$

$C_{D\ avg}$  = average monthly diazinon effluent concentration in µg/L  
 $C_{C\ avg}$  = average monthly chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in µg/L
  - ii. **Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation**

$$S_{avg} = \frac{C_{D\ max}}{0.16} + \frac{C_{C\ max}}{0.025} \leq 1.0$$

$C_{D\ max}$  = maximum daily diazinon effluent concentration in µg/L  
 $C_{C\ max}$  = maximum daily chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in µg/L

**2. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable**

**B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable**

**C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable**

**V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

**A. Surface Water Limitations**

The discharge shall not cause the following in the Sacramento River:

1. **Bacteria.** The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than 10 percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.
2. **Biostimulatory Substances.** Water to contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
3. **Chemical Constituents.** Chemical constituents to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
4. **Color.** Discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
5. **Dissolved Oxygen:**
  - a. The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass
  - b. The 95 percentile dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 75 percent of saturation; nor
  - c. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time.
  - d. From 1 June to 31 August: Concentrations of dissolved oxygen to fall below 9.0 mg/L. When natural conditions lower dissolved oxygen below this level, the concentrations shall be maintained at or above 95 percent saturation.
6. **Floating Material.** Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
7. **Oil and Grease.** Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
8. **pH.** The pH to be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.
9. **Pesticides:**
  - a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
  - b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
  - c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by U.S. EPA or the Executive Officer;
  - d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 CFR 131.12.);

- e. Pesticide concentrations to exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable;
  - f. Pesticides to be present in concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) set forth in CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 15; nor
  - g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.
10. **Radioactivity:**
- a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
  - b. Radionuclides to be present in excess of the MCLs specified in Table 64442 of section 64442 and Table 64443 of section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
11. **Salinity.** Electrical conductivity shall not exceed 230 µmhos/cm (50 percentile) or 235 µmhos/cm (90 percentile) at Knights Landing above Colusa Basin Drain, based upon previous 10 years of record.
12. **Suspended Sediments.** The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters to be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
13. **Settleable Substances.** Substances to be present in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
14. **Suspended Material.** Suspended material to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
15. **Taste and Odors.** Taste- or odor-producing substances to be present in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
16. **Temperature.** The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F. The temperature shall not be elevated above 56°F in the reach from Keswick Dam to Hamilton City during periods when temperature increase will be detrimental to the fishery. Temperature increase is to be determined based on the difference in temperature at RSW-001 and RSW-002.
17. **Toxicity.** Toxic substances to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
18. **Turbidity:**
- a. Shall not exceed 2 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) where natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU;
  - b. Shall not increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTUs;
  - c. Shall not increase more than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs;
  - d. Shall not increase more than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs; nor

- e. Shall not increase more than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

## **B. Groundwater Limitations**

1. The discharge shall not cause the groundwater to exceed water quality objectives, unreasonably affect beneficial uses, or cause a condition of pollution or nuisance. Any increase in total dissolved solids or electrical conductivity concentrations, when compared to background, shall not exceed the increase typically caused by percolation discharge of domestic wastewater, and shall not violate water quality objectives, impact beneficial uses, or cause pollution or nuisance.
2. Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the Facility shall not, in combination with other sources of the waste constituents, cause groundwater within influence of the Facility to contain waste constituents in concentrations in excess of natural background quality of that listed below, whichever is greater:
  - a. Total coliform organisms median of 2.2 MPN/100 mL over any 7-day period.
  - b. Chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

## **VI. PROVISIONS**

### **A. Standard Provisions**

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D.
2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions. In the event that there is any conflict, duplication, or overlap between provisions specified by this Order, the more stringent provision shall apply:
  - a. If the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant is publicly owned or subject to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission, it shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade according to Title 23, CCR, division 3, chapter 26.
  - b. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:
    - i. violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;
    - ii. obtaining this Order by misrepresentation or by failing to disclose fully all relevant facts;
    - iii. a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; and
    - iv. a material change in the character, location, or volume of discharge.

The causes for modification include:

- i. *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under section 405(d) of the CWA, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.
- ii. *Land application plans.* When required by a permit condition to incorporate a land application plan for beneficial reuse of sewage sludge, to revise an existing land application plan, or to add a land application plan.



- iii. *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 CFR 122.62(a)(1), a change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practice is a cause for modification of the permit. It is cause for revocation and reissuance if the Discharger requests or agrees.

The Central Valley Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Central Valley Water Board's own motion.

- c. If a toxic effluent standard or prohibition (including any scheduled compliance specified in such effluent standard or prohibition) is established under section 307(a) of the CWA, or amendments thereto, for a toxic pollutant that is present in the discharge authorized herein, and such standard or prohibition is more stringent than any limitation upon such pollutant in this Order, the Central Valley Water Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such toxic effluent standard or prohibition.

The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards and prohibitions within the time provided in the regulations that establish those standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified.

- d. This Order shall be modified, or alternately revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:
  - i. Contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the Order; or
  - ii. Controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

The Order, as modified or reissued under this paragraph, shall also contain any other requirements of the CWA then applicable.

- e. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provision of this Order is found invalid, the remainder of this Order shall not be affected.
- f. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize any adverse effects to waters of the State or users of those waters resulting from any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order. Reasonable steps shall include such accelerated or additional monitoring as necessary to determine the nature and impact of the non-complying discharge or sludge use or disposal.
- g. The Discharger shall ensure compliance with any existing or future pretreatment standard promulgated by U.S. EPA under section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.
- h. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.
- i. Safeguard to electric power failure:
  - i. The Discharger shall provide safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the discharge shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order.
  - ii. Upon written request by the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a written description of safeguards. Such safeguards may include alternate power sources, standby generators, retention capacity, operating

procedures, or other means. A description of the safeguards provided shall include an analysis of the frequency, duration, and impact of power failures experienced over the past 5 years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.

- iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Central Valley Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within 90 days of having been advised in writing by the Central Valley Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Central Valley Water Board and U.S. EPA a schedule of compliance for providing safeguards such that in the event of reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Discharger shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order. The schedule of compliance shall, upon approval of the Central Valley Water Board, become a condition of this Order.
- j. The Discharger, upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. This report may be combined with that required under the Central Valley Water Board Standard Provision contained in section VI.A.2.i of this Order.

The technical report shall:

- i. Identify the possible sources of spills, leaks, untreated waste by-pass, and contaminated drainage. Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.
- ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and state when they became operational.
- iii. Predict the effectiveness of the proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule containing interim and final dates when they will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

The Central Valley Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions which it deems necessary to control accidental discharges and to minimize the effects of such events. Such conditions shall be incorporated as part of this Order, upon notice to the Discharger.

- k. A publicly owned treatment works whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last 3 years' average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in 4 years, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by 31 January. A copy of the notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies and the press. Within 120 days of the notification, the Discharger shall submit a technical report showing how it will prevent flow volumes from exceeding capacity or how it will increase capacity to handle the larger flows. The Central Valley Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.

- l. The Discharger shall submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer. All technical reports required herein that involve planning, investigation, evaluation, or design, or other work requiring interpretation and proper application of engineering or geologic sciences, shall be prepared by or under the direction of persons registered to practice in California pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1. To demonstrate compliance with Title 16, CCR, sections 415 and 3065, all technical reports must contain a statement of the qualifications of the responsible registered professional(s). As required by these laws, completed technical reports must bear the signature(s) and seal(s) of the registered professional(s) in a manner such that all work can be clearly attributed to the professional responsible for the work.
- m. The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.
- n. For publicly owned treatment works, prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a permanent decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. (Water Code section 1211).
- o. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board.

To assume operation under this Order, the succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing to the Executive Officer requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity's full legal name, the state of incorporation if a corporation, address and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Central Valley Water Board and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory and certification requirements in the federal Standard Provisions (Attachment D, section V.B) and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order. Failure to submit the request shall be considered a discharge without requirements, a violation of the Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

- p. Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges from this facility, may subject the Discharger to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject the Discharger to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, state, or federal law enforcement entities.
- q. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, effluent limitation, or receiving water limitation of this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by telephone (916) 464-3291 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within five days, unless the Central Valley Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall state the nature, time, duration, and cause of noncompliance, and shall describe the measures being taken to remedy the current noncompliance and prevent recurrence including,

where applicable, a schedule of implementation. Other noncompliance requires written notification as above at the time of the normal monitoring report.

**B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements**

The Discharger shall comply with the MRP, and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E.

**C. Special Provisions**

**1. Reopener Provisions**

- a. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR 122.62, including, but not limited to:
  - i. If new or amended applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to section 303 of the CWA, or amendments thereto, this permit may be reopened and modified in accordance with the new or amended standards.
  - ii. When new information, that was not available at the time of permit issuance, would have justified different permit conditions at the time of issuance.
- b. This Order may be reopened for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of a reportable priority pollutant generated by special conditions included in this Order. These special conditions may be, but are not limited to, fish tissue sampling, whole effluent toxicity, monitoring requirements on internal waste stream(s), and monitoring for surrogate parameters. Additional requirements may be included in this Order as a result of the special condition monitoring data.
- c. **Mercury.** If mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted, this Order shall be reopened and an effluent limitation imposed. If the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for Dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to reevaluate the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.
- d. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control provisions that would require the establishment of numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation based on the new provisions.
- e. **Water Effects Ratios (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable, except for copper and zinc. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
- f. **Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos Basin Plan Amendment.** Central Valley Water Board staff is developing a Basin Plan Amendment to provide an implementation plan for NPDES-permitted domestic wastewater dischargers. This Order may be reopened to modify diazinon and chlorpyrifos effluent limitations, as appropriate, in accordance with an amendment to the Basin Plan.

- g. **Dilution Credits.** The Central Valley Water Board may reopen this Order, as appropriate, to modify dilution credits should the facility performance, treatment or characteristics of the discharge or receiving water change. Modification of the dilution credit may include increasing the allowed dilution credit, if necessary.

## 2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Requirements.** For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing, as specified in MRP section V. Furthermore, this Provision requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge exceeds the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring established in this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent recurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site-specific study conducted in a stepwise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TREs are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of whole effluent toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. This Provision includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.
  - i. **Accelerated Monitoring and TRE Initiation.** When the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity monitoring, and the testing meets all test acceptability criteria, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring as required in the Accelerated Monitoring Specifications. The Discharger shall initiate a TRE to address effluent toxicity if any WET testing results exceed the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring.
  - ii. **Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger to initiate a TRE is **>9 TUc** (where TUc = 100/NOEC). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to begin accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE.
  - iii. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring within 14-days of notification by the laboratory of the exceedance. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four chronic toxicity tests conducted once every two weeks using the species that exhibited toxicity. The following protocol shall be used for accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation:
    - (a) If the results of four consecutive accelerated monitoring tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring. However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity, the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.
    - (b) If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (e.g., temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four consecutive accelerated tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger. Upon confirmation that the

effluent toxicity has been removed, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring.

- (c) If the result of any accelerated toxicity test exceeds the monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall cease accelerated monitoring and begin a TRE to investigate the cause(s) of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. Within thirty (30) days of notification by the laboratory of any test result exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan to the Central Valley Water Board including, at minimum:
  - (1) Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including a TRE WET monitoring schedule;
  - (2) Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
  - (3) A schedule for these actions.

Within sixty (60) days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board a TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer. The TRE Workplan shall outline the procedures for identifying the source(s) of, and reducing or eliminating effluent toxicity. The TRE Workplan must be developed in accordance with U.S. EPA guidance<sup>1</sup>.

- b. **Site-Specific Metals Translator Update.** This Order used site-specific dissolved-to-metal translators submitted by the Discharger in establishing final effluent limitations for copper and zinc. The Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board a site-specific translator study update, performed in accordance with Section 1.4.1 of the SIP, by no later than **180 days prior to the expiration of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer.

### 3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger shall continue to implement a salinity evaluation and minimization plan to identify and address sources of salinity from the Facility.

### 4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

- a. **Emergency Storage, Sludge Stabilization, and Drying Ponds Operating Requirements**
  - i. The treatment facilities and emergency storage ponds shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.
  - ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.
  - iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,
    - (a) An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.
    - (b) Weeds shall be minimized.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, section VII.B.2.a.) for a list of U.S. EPA guidance documents that must be considered in development of the TRE Workplan.

- (c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.
- iv. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- v. Ponds shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate allowable wastewater flow and design seasonal precipitation and ancillary inflow and infiltration during the non-irrigation season. Design seasonal precipitation shall be based on total annual precipitation using a return period of 100 years, distributed monthly in accordance with historical rainfall patterns. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- vi. Prior to the onset of the rainy season of each year, available pond storage capacity shall at least equal the volume necessary to comply with the specification at subsection v., above.
- vii. The discharger of waste classified as "hazardous" as defined in section 2521(a) of Title 23, California Code of Regulations (CCR), or "designated", as defined in section 13173 of the Water Code, to the emergency storage pond or treatment ponds is prohibited.
- viii. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the wastewater treatment and disposal areas (or property by the Discharger).
- ix. As means of discerning compliance with item viii. above, the dissolved oxygen content in the upper zone (1 foot) of wastewater in ponds shall not be less than 1.0 mg/L.
- x. The emergency storage pond shall not have a pH less than 6.5 or greater than 8.5 for periods of greater than 72 hours.

##### **5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)**

- a. **Pretreatment Requirements.** The average dry weather design flow for the Facility is less than 5 MGD and the Facility does not receive discharges from Categorical Industrial Users (CIUs) or Significant Industrial Users (SIUs). Under these conditions, the Discharger is not required to develop a pretreatment program pursuant to USEPA regulations set forth in 40 CFR 403. If these conditions change, or other circumstances warrant in order to prevent interference with the POTW or pass through, the Discharger shall comply with the following requirements:
  - i. The Discharger shall be responsible and liable for the performance of all Control Authority pretreatment requirements contained in 40 CFR Part 403, including any subsequent regulatory revisions to 40 CFR Part 403. Where 40 CFR Part 403 or subsequent revision places mandatory actions upon the Discharger as Control Authority but does not specify a timetable for completion of the actions, the Discharger shall complete the required actions within 6 months from the issuance date of this permit or the effective date of the 40 CFR Part 403 revisions, whichever comes later. For violations of pretreatment requirements, the Discharger shall be subject to enforcement actions, penalties, fines, and other remedies by USEPA or other appropriate parties, as provided in the CWA. USEPA may initiate enforcement action against a nondomestic user for noncompliance with applicable standards and requirements as provided in the CWA.

- ii. The Discharger shall enforce the requirements promulgated under sections 307(b), 307(c), 307(d), and 402(b) of the CWA with timely, appropriate and effective enforcement actions. The Discharger shall cause all nondomestic users subject to federal categorical standards to achieve compliance no later than the date specified in those requirements or, in the case of a new nondomestic user, upon commencement of the discharge.
- iii. The Discharger shall perform the pretreatment functions as required in 40 CFR Part 403 including, but not limited to:
  - (a) Implement the necessary legal authorities as provided in 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1);
  - (b) Enforce the pretreatment requirements under 40 CFR 403.5 and 403.6;
  - (c) Implement the programmatic functions as provided in 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2); and
  - (d) Provide the requisite funding and personnel to implement the pretreatment program as provided in 40 CFR 403.8(f)(3).
- iv. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the necessary legal authorities, programs, and controls to ensure that the following incompatible wastes are not introduced to the treatment system, where incompatible wastes are:
  - (a) Wastes which create a fire or explosion hazard in the treatment works;
  - (b) Wastes which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case wastes with a pH lower than 5.0, unless the works is specially designed to accommodate such wastes;
  - (c) Solid or viscous wastes in amounts which cause obstruction to flow in sewers, or which cause other interference with proper operation or treatment works;
  - (d) Any waste, including oxygen demanding pollutants (BOD, etc.), released in such volume or strength as to cause inhibition or disruption in the treatment works, and subsequent treatment process upset and loss of treatment efficiency;
  - (e) Heat in amounts that inhibit or disrupt biological activity in the treatment works, or that raise influent temperatures above 40°C (104°F), unless the Central Valley Water Board approves alternate temperature limits;
  - (f) Petroleum oil, non-biodegradable cutting oil, or products of mineral oil origin in amounts that will cause interference or pass through;
  - (g) Pollutants which result in the presence of toxic gases, vapors, or fumes within the treatment works in a quantity that may cause acute worker health and safety problems; and
  - (h) Any trucked or hauled pollutants, except at points predesignated by the Discharger.
- v. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the legal authorities, programs, and controls necessary to ensure that indirect discharges do not introduce pollutants into the sewerage system that, either alone or in conjunction with a discharge or discharges from other sources:



- (a) Flow through the system to the receiving water in quantities or concentrations that cause a violation of this Order, or:
  - (b) Inhibit or disrupt treatment processes, treatment system operations, or sludge processes, use, or disposal and either cause a violation of this Order or prevent sludge use or disposal in accordance with this Order.
- b. **Sludge/Biosolids Treatment or Discharge Specifications.** Sludge in this document means the solid, semisolid, and liquid residues removed during primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment processes. Solid waste refers to grit and screening material generated during preliminary treatment. Residual sludge means sludge that will not be subject to further treatment at the wastewater treatment plant. Biosolids refer to sludge that has been treated and tested and shown to be capable of being beneficially and legally used pursuant to federal and state regulations as a soil amendment for agricultural, silvicultural, horticultural, and land reclamation activities as specified under 40 CFR Part 503.
  - i. Collected screenings, residual sludge, biosolids, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner approved by the Executive Officer, and consistent with Consolidated Regulations for Treatment, Storage, Processing, or Disposal of Solid Waste, as set forth in Title 27, CCR, division 2, subdivision 1, section 20005, et seq. Removal for further treatment, storage, disposal, or reuse at sites (e.g., landfill, composting sites, soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid waste discharge requirements issued by a Regional Water Board will satisfy these specifications.

Sludge and solid waste shall be removed from screens, sumps, ponds, clarifiers, etc. as needed to ensure optimal plant performance.

The treatment of sludge generated at the Facility shall be confined to the Facility property and conducted in a manner that precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations in section V.B. of this Order. In addition, the storage of residual sludge, solid waste, and biosolids on Facility property shall be temporary and controlled, and contained in a manner that minimizes leachate formation and precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations included in section V.B. of this Order.
  - ii. The use, disposal, storage, and transportation of biosolids shall comply with existing federal and state laws and regulations, including permitting requirements and technical standards included in 40 CFR Part 503. If the State Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 CFR Part 503, this Order may be reopened to incorporate appropriate time schedules and technical standards. The Discharger must comply with the standards and time schedules contained in 40 CFR Part 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.
  - iii. The Discharger shall comply with Section IX.A. Biosolids of the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E.
  - iv. Any proposed change in biosolids use or disposal practice from a previously approved practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and U.S. EPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.

- v. **Within 180 days of the permit effective date**, the Discharger shall submit a biosolids use or disposal plan to the Central Valley Water Board. The plan shall describe at a minimum:
  - (a) Sources and amounts of biosolids generated annually.
  - (b) Location(s) of on-site storage and description of the containment area.
  - (c) Plans for ultimate disposal. For landfill disposal, include the present classification of the landfill and the name and location of the landfill.
- c. **Collection System.** On 2 May 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General WDRs for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ and any future revisions thereto. Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the general WDRs. The Discharger has applied for and has been approved for coverage under Order 2006-0003-DWQ for operation of its wastewater collection system.
- d. **Anaerobically Digestible Material.** If the Discharger proposes to receive hauled-in anaerobically digestible material for injection into an anaerobic digester for co-digestion, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board and develop and implement standard operating procedures (SOP's) for this activity prior to initiation of the hauling. The SOP's shall address material handling, including unloading, screening, or other processing prior to anaerobic digestion; transportation; spill prevention; and spill response. In addition, the SOP's shall address avoidance of the introduction of materials that could cause interference, pass-through, or upset of the treatment processes; avoidance of prohibited material, vector control, odor control, operation and maintenance, and the disposition of any solid waste segregated from introduction to the digester. The Discharger shall provide training to its staff on the SOP's and shall maintain records for a minimum of three years for each load received, describing the hauler, waste type, and quantity received. In addition, the Discharger shall maintain records for a minimum of three years for the disposition, location, and quantity of cumulative pre-digestion-segregated solid waste hauled off-site.

## 6. Other Special Provisions

- a. All storm water shall be directed to the 3 million gallon emergency storage pond, where it may be routed to the headworks, or left to percolate or evaporate. Any change in storm water discharge location is subject to the requirements of the State Water Board General Industrial Storm Water Permit

## 7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

## VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

- A. **BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS Effluent Limitations (Sections IV.A.1.a and IV.A.1.b).** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.a shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.b for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.

- B. Average Dry Weather Flow Effluent Limitation (Section IV.A.1.f).** The average dry weather discharge flow represents the daily average flow when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring. Compliance with the average dry weather flow effluent limitations will be determined annually based on the average daily flow over three consecutive dry weather months (e.g., July, August, and September).
- C. Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.e).** For each day that an effluent sample is collected and analyzed for total coliform organisms, the 7-day median shall be determined by calculating the median concentration of total coliform bacteria in the effluent utilizing the bacteriological results of the last 7 days. For example, if a sample is collected on a Wednesday, the result from that sampling event and all results from the previous 6 days (i.e., Tuesday, Monday, Sunday, Saturday, Friday, and Thursday) are used to calculate the 7-day median. If the 7-day median of total coliform organisms exceeds a most probable number (MPN) of 23 per 100 milliliters, the Discharger will be considered out of compliance.
- D. Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.d).** Continuous monitoring analyzers for chlorine residual or for dechlorination agent residual in the effluent are appropriate methods for compliance determination. A positive residual dechlorination agent in the effluent indicates that chlorine is not present in the discharge, which demonstrates compliance with the effluent limitations. This type of monitoring can also be used to prove that some chlorine residual exceedances are false positives. Continuous monitoring data showing either a positive dechlorination agent residual or a chlorine residual at or below the prescribed limit are sufficient to show compliance with the total residual chlorine effluent limitations, as long as the instruments are maintained and calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

Any excursion above the 1-hour average or 4-day average total residual chlorine effluent limitations is a violation. If the Discharger conducts continuous monitoring and the Discharger can demonstrate, through data collected from a back-up monitoring system, that a chlorine spike recorded by the continuous monitor was not actually due to chlorine, then any excursion resulting from the recorded spike will not be considered an exceedance, but rather reported as a false positive. Records supporting validation of false positives shall be maintained in accordance with Section IV Standard Provisions (Attachment D).

- E. Mass Effluent Limitations.** The mass effluent limitations contained in the Final Effluent Limitations IV.A.1.a are based on the permitted average dry weather flow and calculated as follows:

$$\text{Mass (lbs/day)} = \text{Flow (MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34 \text{ (conversion factor)}$$

If the effluent flow exceeds the permitted average dry weather flow during wet-weather seasons, the effluent mass limitations contained in Final Effluent Limitations IV.A.1.a shall not apply. If the effluent flow is below the permitted average dry weather flow during wet-weather seasons, the effluent mass limitations do apply.

- F. Priority Pollutant Effluent Limitations.** Compliance with effluent limitations for priority pollutants shall be determined in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of the SIP, as follows:
1. Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation, if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reporting level (RL).
  2. Dischargers shall be required to conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP) in accordance with section 2.4.5.1 of the SIP when there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either:

- a. A sample result is reported as detected, but not quantified (DNQ) and the effluent limitation is less than the RL; or
  - b. A sample result is reported as non-detect (ND) and the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit (MDL).
3. When determining compliance with an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and more than one sample result is available in a month, the discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of DNQ or ND. In those cases, the discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
  - a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
  - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
4. If a sample result, or the arithmetic mean or median of multiple sample results, is below the RL, and there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and the discharger conducts a PMP (as described in section 2.4.5.1), the discharger shall not be deemed out of compliance.

## ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

### **Arithmetic Mean ( $\mu$ )**

Also called the average, is the sum of measured values divided by the number of samples. For ambient water concentrations, the arithmetic mean is calculated as follows:

Arithmetic mean =  $\mu = \Sigma x / n$       where:  $\Sigma x$  is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations, and  $n$  is the number of samples.

### **Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)**

The highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that month.

### **Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)**

The highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar week (Sunday through Saturday), calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar week divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that week.

### **Bioaccumulative**

Those substances taken up by an organism from its surrounding medium through gill membranes, epithelial tissue, or from food and subsequently concentrated and retained in the body of the organism.

### **Carcinogenic**

Pollutants are substances that are known to cause cancer in living organisms.

### **Coefficient of Variation (CV)**

CV is a measure of the data variability and is calculated as the estimated standard deviation divided by the arithmetic mean of the observed values.

### **Daily Discharge**

Daily Discharge is defined as either: (1) the total mass of the constituent discharged over the calendar day (12:00 am through 11:59 pm) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling (as specified in the permit), for a constituent with limitations expressed in units of mass or; (2) the unweighted arithmetic mean measurement of the constituent over the day for a constituent with limitations expressed in other units of measurement (e.g., concentration).

The daily discharge may be determined by the analytical results of a composite sample taken over the course of one day (a calendar day or other 24-hour period defined as a day) or by the arithmetic mean of analytical results from one or more grab samples taken over the course of the day.

For composite sampling, if 1 day is defined as a 24-hour period other than a calendar day, the analytical result for the 24-hour period will be considered as the result for the calendar day in which the 24-hour period ends.

### **Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)**

DNQ are those sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL. Sample results reported as DNQ are estimated concentrations.

**Dilution Credit**

Dilution Credit is the amount of dilution granted to a discharge in the calculation of a water quality-based effluent limitation, based on the allowance of a specified mixing zone. It is calculated from the dilution ratio or determined through conducting a mixing zone study or modeling of the discharge and receiving water.

**Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)**

ECA is a value derived from the water quality criterion/objective, dilution credit, and ambient background concentration that is used, in conjunction with the coefficient of variation for the effluent monitoring data, to calculate a long-term average (LTA) discharge concentration. The ECA has the same meaning as waste load allocation (WLA) as used in U.S. EPA guidance (Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control, March 1991, second printing, EPA/505/2-90-001).

**Enclosed Bays**

Enclosed Bays means indentations along the coast that enclose an area of oceanic water within distinct headlands or harbor works. Enclosed bays include all bays where the narrowest distance between the headlands or outermost harbor works is less than 75 percent of the greatest dimension of the enclosed portion of the bay. Enclosed bays include, but are not limited to, Humboldt Bay, Bodega Harbor, Tomales Bay, Drake's Estero, San Francisco Bay, Morro Bay, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, Upper and Lower Newport Bay, Mission Bay, and San Diego Bay. Enclosed bays do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

**Estimated Chemical Concentration**

The estimated chemical concentration that results from the confirmed detection of the substance by the analytical method below the ML value.

**Estuaries**

Estuaries means waters, including coastal lagoons, located at the mouths of streams that serve as areas of mixing for fresh and ocean waters. Coastal lagoons and mouths of streams that are temporarily separated from the ocean by sandbars shall be considered estuaries. Estuarine waters shall be considered to extend from a bay or the open ocean to a point upstream where there is no significant mixing of fresh water and seawater. Estuarine waters included, but are not limited to, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, as defined in Water Code section 12220, Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait downstream to the Carquinez Bridge, and appropriate areas of the Smith, Mad, Eel, Noyo, Russian, Klamath, San Diego, and Otay rivers. Estuaries do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

**Inland Surface Waters**

All surface waters of the state that do not include the ocean, enclosed bays, or estuaries.

**Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation**

The highest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous maximum limitation).

**Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation**

The lowest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous minimum limitation).

### **Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)**

The highest allowable daily discharge of a pollutant, over a calendar day (or 24-hour period). For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the daily discharge is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurement, the daily discharge is calculated as the arithmetic mean measurement of the pollutant over the day.

### **Median**

The middle measurement in a set of data. The median of a set of data is found by first arranging the measurements in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order). If the number of measurements ( $n$ ) is odd, then the median =  $X_{(n+1)/2}$ . If  $n$  is even, then the median =  $(X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2)+1})/2$  (i.e., the midpoint between the  $n/2$  and  $n/2+1$ ).

### **Method Detection Limit (MDL)**

MDL is the minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured and reported with 99 percent confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero, as defined in 40 C.F.R. part 136, Attachment B, revised as of July 3, 1999.

### **Minimum Level (ML)**

ML is the concentration at which the entire analytical system must give a recognizable signal and acceptable calibration point. The ML is the concentration in a sample that is equivalent to the concentration of the lowest calibration standard analyzed by a specific analytical procedure, assuming that all the method specified sample weights, volumes, and processing steps have been followed.

### **Mixing Zone**

Mixing Zone is a limited volume of receiving water that is allocated for mixing with a wastewater discharge where water quality criteria can be exceeded without causing adverse effects to the overall water body.

### **Not Detected (ND)**

Sample results which are less than the laboratory's MDL.

### **Ocean Waters**

The territorial marine waters of the State as defined by California law to the extent these waters are outside of enclosed bays, estuaries, and coastal lagoons. Discharges to ocean waters are regulated in accordance with the State Water Board's California Ocean Plan.

### **Persistent Pollutants**

Persistent pollutants are substances for which degradation or decomposition in the environment is nonexistent or very slow.

### **Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)**

PMP means waste minimization and pollution prevention actions that include, but are not limited to, product substitution, waste stream recycling, alternative waste management methods, and education of the public and businesses. The goal of the PMP shall be to reduce all potential sources of a priority pollutant(s) through pollutant minimization (control) strategies, including pollution prevention measures as appropriate, to maintain the effluent concentration at or below the water quality-based effluent limitation. Pollution prevention measures may be particularly appropriate for persistent bioaccumulative priority pollutants where there is evidence that beneficial uses are being impacted. The Central Valley Water Board may consider cost effectiveness when establishing the requirements of a PMP. The completion and implementation of a Pollution Prevention Plan, if required pursuant to Water Code section 13263.3(d), shall be considered to fulfill the PMP requirements.

### **Pollution Prevention**

Pollution Prevention means any action that causes a net reduction in the use or generation of a hazardous substance or other pollutant that is discharged into water and includes, but is not limited to, input change, operational improvement, production process change, and product reformulation (as defined in Water Code section 13263.3). Pollution prevention does not include actions that merely shift a pollutant in wastewater from one environmental medium to another environmental medium, unless clear environmental benefits of such an approach are identified to the satisfaction of the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) or Central Valley Water Board.

### **Satellite Collection System**

The portion, if any, of a sanitary sewer system owned or operated by a different public agency than the agency that owns and operates the wastewater treatment facility that a sanitary sewer system is tributary to.

### **Source of Drinking Water**

Any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) in a Central Valley Water Board Basin Plan.

### **Standard Deviation ( $\sigma$ )**

Standard Deviation is a measure of variability that is calculated as follows:

$$\sigma = (\sum[(x - \mu)^2]/(n - 1))^{0.5}$$

where:

x is the observed value;

$\mu$  is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and


n is the number of samples.

### **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)**


TRE is a study conducted in a step-wise process designed to identify the causative agents of effluent or ambient toxicity, isolate the sources of toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of toxicity control options, and then confirm the reduction in toxicity. The first steps of the TRE consist of the collection of data relevant to the toxicity, including additional toxicity testing, and an evaluation of facility operations and maintenance practices, and best management practices. A Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) may be required as part of the TRE, if appropriate. (A TIE is a set of procedures to identify the specific chemical(s) responsible for toxicity. These procedures are performed in three phases (characterization, identification, and confirmation) using aquatic organism toxicity tests.)



# ATTACHMENT B – MAP



ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC



## **ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS**

### **I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE**

#### **A. Duty to Comply**

1. The Discharger must comply with all of the terms, requirements, and conditions of this Order. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action; permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; denial of a permit renewal application; or a combination thereof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a); Wat. Code, §§ 13261, 13263, 13265, 13268, 13000, 12001, 13304, 13350, 13385.)
2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under Section 405(d) of the CWA within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a)(1).)

#### **B. Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense**

It shall not be a defense for a Discharger in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(c).)

#### **C. Duty to Mitigate**

The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(d).)

#### **D. Proper Operation and Maintenance**

The Discharger shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the Discharger to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. Proper operation and maintenance also includes adequate laboratory controls and appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of backup or auxiliary facilities or similar systems that are installed by a Discharger only when necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(e).)

#### **E. Property Rights**

1. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(g).)
2. The issuance of this Order does not authorize any injury to persons or property or invasion of other private rights, or any infringement of state or local law or regulations. (40 C.F.R. § 122.5(c).)

#### **F. Inspection and Entry**

The Discharger shall allow the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. EPA, and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383):

1. Enter upon the Discharger's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383); and
4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the Water Code, any substances or parameters at any location. (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383.)

#### **G. Bypass**

1. Definitions
  - a. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(i).)
  - b. "Severe property damage" means substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities, which causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources that can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(ii).)
2. Bypass not exceeding limitations. The Discharger may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause exceedances of effluent limitations, but only if it is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3, I.G.4, and I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(2).)
3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Central Valley Water Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)):
  - a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A));
  - b. There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and
  - c. The Discharger submitted notice to the Central Valley Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C).)
4. The Central Valley Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Central Valley Water Board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(ii).)

5. Notice

- a. Anticipated bypass. If the Discharger knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit a notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i).)
- b. Unanticipated bypass. The Discharger shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii).)

**H. Upset**

Upset means an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the Discharger. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or improper operation. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(1).)

1. Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2).)
2. Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset. A Discharger who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)):
  - a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i));
  - b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii));
  - c. The Discharger submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.E.2.b below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and
  - d. The Discharger complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.C above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iv).)
3. Burden of proof. In any enforcement proceeding, the Discharger seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(4).)

**II. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION**

**A. General**

This Order may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the Discharger for modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any Order condition. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(f).)

**B. Duty to Reapply**

If the Discharger wishes to continue an activity regulated by this Order after the expiration date of this Order, the Discharger must apply for and obtain a new permit. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(b).)

**C. Transfers**

This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Central Valley Water Board. The Central Valley Water Board may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the Order to change the name of the Discharger and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the CWA and the Water Code. (40 C.F.R. §§ 122.41(l)(3); 122.61.)

**III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING**

- A.** Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(1).)
- B.** Monitoring results must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analyses of pollutants unless another method is required under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O. In the case of pollutants for which there are not approved methods under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or otherwise required under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, monitoring must be conducted according to a test procedure specified in this Order for such pollutants. (40 C.F.R. §§ 122.41(j)(4); 122.44(i)(1)(iv).)

**IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS**

- A.** Except for records of monitoring information required by this Order related to the Discharger's sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five years (or longer as required by 40 C.F.R. part 503), the Discharger shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the application for this Order, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer at any time. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(2).)
- B.** Records of monitoring information shall include:
  - 1. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(i));
  - 2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(ii));
  - 3. The date(s) analyses were performed (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iii));
  - 4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iv));
  - 5. The analytical techniques or methods used (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(v)); and
  - 6. The results of such analyses. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(vi).)
- C.** Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)):
  - 1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Discharger (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(1)); and
  - 2. Permit applications and attachments, permits and effluent data. (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(2).)

**V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING**

**A. Duty to Provide Information**

The Discharger shall furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Central Valley Water Board, State

Water Board, or U.S. EPA may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this Order or to determine compliance with this Order. Upon request, the Discharger shall also furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(h); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383.)

**B. Signatory and Certification Requirements**

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, and/or U.S. EPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, and V.B.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(k).)
2. All permit applications shall be signed by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this provision, a principal executive officer of a federal agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., Regional Administrators of U.S. EPA). (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(3).)
3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
  - a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1));
  - b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and
  - c. The written authorization is submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3).)
4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c).)
5. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 or V.B.3 above shall make the following certification:

“I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(d).)

**C. Monitoring Reports**

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4).)
2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board for reporting results of monitoring of sludge use or disposal practices. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i).)
3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Central Valley Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(ii).)
4. Calculations for all limitations, which require averaging of measurements, shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(iii).)

**D. Compliance Schedules**

Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this Order, shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(5).)

**E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting**

1. The Discharger shall report any noncompliance that may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. A written submission shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i).)
2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)):
  - a. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A).)
  - b. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B).)
3. The Central Valley Water Board may waive the above-required written report under this provision on a case-by-case basis if an oral report has been received within 24 hours. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(iii).)

**F. Planned Changes**

The Discharger shall give notice to the Central Valley Water Board as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility. Notice is required under this provision only when (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)):

1. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in section 122.29(b) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(i)); or



2. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are not subject to effluent limitations in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii).)

The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(iii).)

**G. Anticipated Noncompliance**

The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with this Order's requirements. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(2).)

**H. Other Noncompliance**

The Discharger shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.C, V.D, and V.E above at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in Standard Provision – Reporting V.E above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(7).)

**I. Other Information**

When the Discharger becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8).)

**VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT**

- A. The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.

**VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS**

**A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)**

All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Central Valley Water Board of the following (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)):

1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to sections 301 or 306 of the CWA if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(1)); and
2. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of the Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(2).)
3. Adequate notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW as well as any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(3).)

## ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

### Contents

I.	General Monitoring Provisions .....	E-2
II.	Monitoring Locations .....	E-3
III.	Influent Monitoring Requirements .....	E-3
	A. Monitoring Location INF-001 .....	E-3
	B. Monitoring Location SEC-001 .....	E-4
IV.	Effluent Monitoring Requirements .....	E-4
	A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 .....	E-4
V.	Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements .....	E-6
VI.	Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable.....	E-8
VII.	Recycling Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable .....	E-8
VIII.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements.....	E-8
	A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002 .....	E-8
IX.	Other Monitoring Requirements .....	E-10
	A. Biosolids .....	E-10
	B. Municipal Water Supply .....	E-10
	C. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization .....	E-11
X.	Reporting Requirements .....	E-15
	A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements .....	E-15
	B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs).....	E-15
	C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs).....	E-18
	D. Other Reports .....	E-18

### Tables

Table E-1.	Monitoring Station Locations .....	E-3
Table E-2.	Influent Monitoring – Monitoring Location INF-001 .....	E-3
Table E-3.	Influent Monitoring – Monitoring Location SEC-001 .....	E-4
Table E-4.	Effluent Monitoring .....	E-4
Table E-5.	Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series.....	E-7
Table E-6.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Monitoring Location RSW-001 .....	E-8
Table E-7.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Monitoring Location RSW-002.....	E-9
Table E-8.	Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements .....	E-10
Table E-9.	Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring .....	E-11
Table E-10.	Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule.....	E-16

## **ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)**

The Code of Federal Regulations (40 C.F.R. § 122.48) requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. This MRP establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and California regulations.

### **I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS**

- A.** Samples and measurements taken as required herein shall be representative of the volume and nature of the monitored discharge. All samples shall be taken at the monitoring locations specified below and, unless otherwise specified, before the monitored flow joins or is diluted by any other waste stream, body of water, or substance. Monitoring locations shall not be changed without notification to and the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.
- B.** Effluent samples shall be taken downstream of the last addition of wastes to the treatment or discharge works where a representative sample may be obtained prior to mixing with the receiving waters. Samples shall be collected at such a point and in such a manner to ensure a representative sample of the discharge.
- C.** Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses of any material required by this Order shall be conducted by a laboratory certified for such analyses by the Department of Public Health (DPH). Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Central Valley Water Board. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger for any onsite field measurements such as pH, DO, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine, such analyses performed by a noncertified laboratory will be accepted provided a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program is instituted by the laboratory. A manual containing the steps followed in this program for any onsite field measurements such as pH, DO, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine must be kept onsite in the treatment facility laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Central Valley Water Board staff. The Discharger must demonstrate sufficient capability (qualified and trained employees, properly calibrated and maintained field instruments, etc.) to adequately perform these field measurements. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to U.S. EPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Central Valley Water Board.
- D.** Appropriate flow measurement devices and methods consistent with accepted scientific practices shall be selected and used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of measurements of the volume of monitored discharges. All monitoring instruments and devices used by the Discharger to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary, at least yearly, to ensure their continued accuracy. All flow measurement devices shall be calibrated at least once per year to ensure continued accuracy of the devices.
- E.** Monitoring results, including noncompliance, shall be reported at intervals and in a manner specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- F.** Laboratories analyzing monitoring samples shall be certified by the Department of Public Health (DPH), in accordance with the provision of Water Code section 13176, and must include quality assurance/quality control data with their reports.
- G.** In accordance with Clean Water Act section 308, the Discharger shall ensure that results of the Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study or the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Resources Control Board at the following address:

State Water Board Quality Assurance Program Officer  
Office of Information Management and Analysis

State Water Resources Control Board  
1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

- H. The Discharger shall file with the Central Valley Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- I. The results of all monitoring required by this Order shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board, and shall be submitted in such a format as to allow direct comparison with the limitations and requirements of this Order. Unless otherwise specified, discharge flows shall be reported in terms of the monthly average and the daily maximum discharge flows.

## II. MONITORING LOCATIONS

The Discharger shall establish the following monitoring locations to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitations, discharge specifications, and other requirements in this Order:

**Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations**

Discharge Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Monitoring Location Description
--	INF-001	A location where a representative sample of the influent into the Facility can be collected prior to entering the treatment process. Latitude: 40° 27' 55" N, Longitude: 122° 16' 30" W
--	SEC-001	Located at the weir box downstream of the secondary clarifiers and prior to the ballast pond and Filter Pumps Manhole 1 and 2.
001	EFF-001	Downstream from last connection through which wastes can be admitted into the outfall. Latitude: 40° 27' 53" N, Longitude: 122° 16' 27" W
--	RSW-001	In the Sacramento River, 100 feet upstream of Discharge Point 001 Latitude: 40° 28' 4.6" N, Longitude: 122° 16' 43" W
--	RSW-002	In the Sacramento River, 1/4 mile downstream of Discharge Point 001 Latitude: 40° 28' 9", Longitude: 122° 16' 24"
--	BIO-001	A location where a representative sample of biosolids can be obtained.
--	SPL-001	A location where a representative sample of the municipal water supply can be obtained.

The North latitude and West longitude information in Table E-1 are approximate for administrative purposes.

## III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

### A. Monitoring Location INF-001

- 1. The Discharger shall monitor influent to the Facility at Monitoring Location INF-001 as follows:

**Table E-2. Influent Monitoring – Monitoring Location INF-001**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	2/Month <sup>2</sup>	<sup>3</sup>

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
pH	standard units	Grab <sup>4</sup>	2/Week	<sup>3</sup>
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	2/Month <sup>2</sup>	<sup>3</sup>
<b>Priority Pollutants</b>				
Total Recoverable Metals <sup>5</sup>	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	1/Year	<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 24-hour flow proportional or time-weighted composite.

<sup>2</sup> A minimum of 7 days required between each sampling event.

<sup>3</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>4</sup> Grab samples shall not be collected at the same time each day to get a complete representation of variations in the influent.

<sup>5</sup> Monitoring shall include total recoverable concentrations of cadmium, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc. Influent hardness and pH shall be determined at the same time. Sample shall be collected at the same time effluent samples are obtained for priority pollutant analysis.

#### B. Monitoring Location SEC-001

- The Discharger shall monitor influent to the Facility at Monitoring Location SEC-001 as follows:

**Table E-3. Influent Monitoring – Monitoring Location SEC-001**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--

### IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

#### A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

- The Discharger shall monitor treated effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as follows. If more than one analytical test method is listed for a given parameter, the Discharger must select from the listed methods and corresponding Minimum Level:

**Table E-4. Effluent Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	1/Week	<sup>2</sup>
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Week	--
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Day <sup>3</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	1/Week	<sup>2</sup>
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Week	--
<b>Priority Pollutants</b>				
Bis (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2,5,6</sup>
Cadmium, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2,5</sup>

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
		Composite <sup>1</sup>		
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	1/Month	2,5
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	Grab	1/Month	2,5
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab	1/Month	2,5
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	1/Month	2,5
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern	See Section IX.C	See Section IX.C	See Section IX.C	2,5
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N) <sup>17</sup>	mg/L	Grab	2/Month <sup>3,7,16</sup>	2
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	Meter	Continuous	2,8
Chlorpyrifos	µg/L	Grab	1/Year <sup>9</sup>	2
Diazinon	µg/L	Grab	1/Year <sup>9</sup>	2
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Month	2
Hardness, Total (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>10</sup>	2
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>11</sup>	2
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>11</sup>	2
Nitrite Plus Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	1/Month	--
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	2
Phosphorous, Total (as P)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	2
Standard Minerals <sup>12</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	2
Temperature	°F (°C)	Grab	1/Week <sup>3,13</sup>	2
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	2/Week <sup>14</sup>	2
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>15</sup>	2

<sup>1</sup> 24-hour flow proportional or time-weighted composite.

<sup>2</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>3</sup> pH and temperature shall be recorded at the time of ammonia sample collection.

<sup>4</sup> Monitoring shall be conducted quarterly for the first 2 years of the permit term.

<sup>5</sup> For priority pollutant constituents the reporting level shall be consistent with Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment E, section IX.C).

<sup>6</sup> In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present in the effluent discharge, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.

<sup>7</sup> Concurrent with whole effluent toxicity monitoring.

<sup>8</sup> Total chlorine residual must be monitored with a method sensitive to and accurate at the permitted level of 0.01 mg/L.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. EPA Method 625M, Method 8141, or equivalent. Minimum reporting limits: <100 ng/L diazinon; <15 ng/L chlorpyrifos.

<sup>10</sup> Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

<sup>11</sup> Monitoring for nitrite and nitrate shall be conducted concurrently.

<sup>12</sup> Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

<sup>13</sup> A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a U.S. EPA-approved algorithm/method

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
-----------	-------	-------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.

14 Samples for total coliform organisms may be collected at any point following disinfection.

15 Concurrent with electrical conductivity monitoring

16 A minimum of 7 days required between each sampling event.

17 Total ammonia nitrogen (TAN) is the sum of ammonium ion ( $\text{NH}_4^+$ ) and unionized ammonia ( $\text{NH}_3$ ).

## V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS

**A. Acute Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing acute toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following acute toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform quarterly acute toxicity testing, concurrent with effluent ammonia sampling.
2. Sample Types – The Discharger may use flow-through or static renewal testing. For static renewal testing, the samples shall be grab samples and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001.
3. Test Species – Test species shall be rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).
4. Methods – The acute toxicity testing samples shall be analyzed using EPA-821-R-02-012, Fifth Edition. Temperature, total residual chlorine, and pH shall be recorded at the time of sample collection. No pH adjustment may be made unless approved by the Executive Officer.
5. Test Failure – If an acute toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria, as specified in the test method, the Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 7 days following notification of test failure.

**B. Chronic Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall conduct three species chronic toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing chronic toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform annual three species chronic toxicity testing.
2. Sample Types – Effluent samples shall be flow proportional or time-weighted 24-hour composites and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001. If receiving water is used as control water, then the receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from Monitoring Location RSW-001, as identified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
3. Sample Volumes – Adequate sample volumes shall be collected to provide renewal water to complete the test in the event that the discharge is intermittent.
4. Test Species – Chronic toxicity testing measures sublethal (e.g., reduced growth, reproduction) and/or lethal effects to test organisms exposed to an effluent compared to that of the control organisms. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with:
  - a. The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);

- b. The fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas* (larval survival and growth test); and
- c. The green alga, *Selenastrum capricornutum* (growth test).
5. **Methods** – The presence of chronic toxicity shall be estimated as specified in *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002.
6. **Reference Toxicant** – As required by the SIP, all chronic toxicity tests shall be conducted with concurrent testing with a reference toxicant and shall be reported with the chronic toxicity test results.
7. **Dilutions** - The chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-5, below. For TRE monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-5, below, unless an alternative dilution series is detailed in the submitted TRE Action Plan. A receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

**Table E-5. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series**

Sample	Dilutions <sup>a</sup> (%)					Control
	100	75	50	25	12.5	
% Effluent	100	75	50	25	12.5	0
% Control Water	0	25	50	75	87.5	100

<sup>a</sup> Receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

8. **Test Failure** – The Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but no later than fourteen (14) days after receiving notification of a test failure. A test failure is defined as follows:
  - a. The reference toxicant test or the effluent test does not meet all test acceptability criteria as specified in the *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002 (Method Manual), and its subsequent amendments or revisions; or
  - b. The percent minimum significant difference (PMSD) measured for the test exceeds the upper PMSD bound variability criterion in Table 6 on page 52 of the Method Manual. (A retest is only required in this case if the test results do not exceed the monitoring trigger specified in the Special Provision at section VI. 2.a.iii. of the Order.)
- C. **WET Testing Notification Requirements.** The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board within 24-hours after the receipt of test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during regular or accelerated monitoring, or an exceedance of the acute toxicity effluent limitation.
- D. **WET Testing Reporting Requirements.** All toxicity test reports shall include the contracting laboratory's complete report provided to the Discharger and shall be in accordance with the appropriate "Report Preparation and Test Review" sections of the method manuals. At a minimum, whole effluent toxicity monitoring shall be reported as follows:
  1. **Chronic WET Reporting.** Regular chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board within 30 days following completion of the test, and shall contain, at minimum:



- a. The results expressed in TUC, measured as 100/NOEC, and also measured as 100/LC50, 100/EC25, 100/IC25, and 100/IC50, as appropriate.
- b. The statistical methods used to calculate endpoints;
- c. The statistical output page, which includes the calculation of the percent minimum significant difference (PMSD);
- d. The dates of sample collection and initiation of each toxicity test; and
- e. The results compared to the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger.

Additionally, the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports shall contain an updated chronology of chronic toxicity test results expressed in TUC, and organized by test species, type of test (survival, growth or reproduction), and monitoring frequency, i.e., either quarterly, monthly, accelerated, or Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE).

2. **Acute WET Reporting.** Acute toxicity test results shall be submitted with the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports and reported as percent survival.
3. **TRE Reporting.** Reports for TREs shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger's approved TRE Workplan, or as amended by the Discharger's TRE Action Plan.
4. **Quality Assurance (QA).** The Discharger must provide the following information for QA purposes:
  - a. Results of the applicable reference toxicant data with the statistical output page giving the species, NOEC, LOEC, type of toxicant, dilution water used, concentrations used, PMSD, and dates tested.
  - b. The reference toxicant control charts for each endpoint, which include summaries of reference toxicant tests performed by the contracting laboratory.
  - c. Any information on deviations or problems encountered and how they were dealt with.

## VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

## VII. RECYCLING MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

## VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

### A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002

1. The Discharger shall monitor the Sacramento River at Monitoring Location RSW-001 as follows:

**Table E-6. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Monitoring Location RSW-001**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>				
pH	standard units	Grab <sup>5</sup>	1/Week	1
<b>Priority Pollutants</b>				
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>2</sup>	1,3
Copper, Dissolved	µg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>2</sup>	1,3
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>2</sup>	1,3
Zinc, Dissolved	µg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>2</sup>	1,3
Priority Pollutants and Other	See	See	See	1,3

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Constituents of Concern	Section IX.C	Section IX.C	Section IX.C	
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total <sup>6</sup> (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	1
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab <sup>5</sup>	1/Week	1
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab <sup>5</sup>	1/Month	1
Hardness, Total (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	1
Standard Minerals <sup>4</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	1
Temperature	°F (°C)	Grab <sup>5</sup>	1/Week	1
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	1

<sup>1</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>2</sup> Receiving water hardness and pH required at time of sampling.

<sup>3</sup> For priority pollutant constituents the reporting level shall be consistent with Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment E, section IX.C).

<sup>4</sup> Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

<sup>5</sup> A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a USEPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.

<sup>6</sup> Total ammonia nitrogen (TAN) is the sum of ammonium ion (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and unionized ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>).

2. The Discharger shall monitor the Sacramento River at Monitoring Location RSW-002 as follows:

**Table E-7. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Monitoring Location RSW-002**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>				
pH	standard units	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Week	1
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Week	1
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Month	1
Temperature	°F (°C)	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Week	1
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	1

<sup>1</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>2</sup> A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a USEPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.

3. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of:
  - a. Floating or suspended matter;
  - b. Discoloration;
  - c. Bottom deposits;
  - d. Aquatic life;
  - e. Visible films, sheens, or coatings;
  - f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths; and
  - g. Potential nuisance conditions.

Notes on receiving water conditions shall be summarized in the monitoring report.

## IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

### A. Biosolids

#### 1. Monitoring Location BIO-001

- a. A composite sample of sludge shall be collected once during the permit term at Monitoring Location BIO-001 in accordance with U.S. EPA's *POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document*, August 1989, and tested for priority pollutants listed in 40 CFR Part 122, Appendix D, Tables II and III (excluding total phenols).
- b. Biosolids monitoring shall be conducted using the methods in Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical methods (EPA publication SW-846), as required in 40 CFR 503.8(b)(4). All results must be reported on a 100% dry weight basis. Records of all analyses must state on each page of the laboratory report whether the results are expressed in "100% dry weight" or "as is."
- c. Sampling records shall be retained for a minimum of **5 years**. A log shall be maintained of sludge quantities generated and of handling and disposal activities. The frequency of entries is discretionary; however, the log must be complete enough to serve as a basis for part of the annual report.

### B. Municipal Water Supply

#### 1. Monitoring Location SPL-001

- a. The Discharger shall monitor the municipal water supply at Monitoring Location SPL-001 as follows.

**Table E-8. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Total Dissolved Solids <sup>1</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	<sup>2</sup>
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C <sup>1</sup>	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Quarter	<sup>2</sup>
Standard Minerals <sup>3</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	<sup>2</sup>
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	<sup>2</sup>
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	<sup>2</sup>

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
-----------	-------	-------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

- <sup>1</sup> If the water supply is from more than one source, the total dissolved solids and electrical conductivity shall be reported as a weighted average and include copies of supporting calculations.
- <sup>2</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.
- <sup>3</sup> Standard minerals shall include all major cations and anions and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

### C. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization

1. **Quarterly Monitoring.** Quarterly priority pollutant samples shall be collected from the effluent and upstream receiving water (Monitoring Locations EFF-001 and RSW-001) and analyzed for the constituents listed in Table E-9, below. Quarterly monitoring shall be conducted during the third year of the permit term (four consecutive samples, evenly distributed throughout the year) and the results of such monitoring be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board with the quarterly self-monitoring reports. Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent and upstream receiving water.
2. **Concurrent Sampling.** Effluent and receiving water sampling shall be performed at approximately the same time, on the same date.
3. **Sample type.** All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples. Effluent samples shall be taken as described in Table E-9, below.

**Table E-9. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
1,1-Dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	1
1,1-Dichloroethene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	2
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	2
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	µg/L	Grab	--
1,2-Dichloropropane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	2
1,3-Dichloropropene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	2
Acrolein	µg/L	Grab	2
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	Grab	2
Benzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Bromoform	µg/L	Grab	2
Bromomethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Carbon tetrachloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chlorobenzene (mono chlorobenzene)	µg/L	Grab	2
Chloroethane	µg/L	Grab	2
2- Chloroethyl vinyl ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Chloroform	µg/L	Grab	2
Chloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
Dibromochloromethane <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Dichlorobromomethane <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Dichloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	Grab	2
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	1
Naphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
Tetrachloroethene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Toluene	µg/L	Grab	2
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	Grab	1
Trichloroethene	µg/L	Grab	2
Vinyl chloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	µg/L	Grab	--
Trichlorofluoromethane	µg/L	Grab	--
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-Trifluoroethane	µg/L	Grab	--
Styrene	µg/L	Grab	--
Xylenes	µg/L	Grab	--
1,2-Benzanthracene	µg/L	Grab	5
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	Grab	1
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	Grab	2
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
3,4-Benzofluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	5
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	5
Acenaphthene	µg/L	Grab	1
Acenaphthylene	µg/L	Grab	10
Anthracene	µg/L	Grab	10
Benzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)	µg/L	Grab	2
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	2
Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane	µg/L	Grab	5
Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	10
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	Grab <sup>3</sup>	5
Butyl benzyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
Chrysene	µg/L	Grab	5
Di-n-butylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Di-n-octylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene	µg/L	Grab	0.1
Diethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dimethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluorene	µg/L	Grab	10
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	Grab	5
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	µg/L	Grab	0.05
Isophorone	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	Grab	10
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Phenanthrene	µg/L	Grab	5
Phenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Pyrene	µg/L	Grab	10
Aluminum	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Antimony	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	5
Arsenic	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	10
Asbestos	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Barium	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Beryllium	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	2
Cadmium, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.25
Cadmium, Dissolved	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Chromium (III)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	50
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	10
Copper, Total Recoverable <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	2
Copper, Dissolved <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Cyanide	µg/L	Grab	5
Fluoride	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Iron	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Lead, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
Lead, Dissolved	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Mercury	µg/L	Grab	0.2
Molybdenum	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Nickel, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	20
Nickel, Dissolved	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Selenium	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	2
Silver, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.25
Silver, Dissolved	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Thallium	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	1
Tributyltin	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Zinc, Total Recoverable <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	10
Zinc, Dissolved <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.05
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.05
4,4'-DDT	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.02
alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane (BHC)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Alachlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Aldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.005
beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.005
Chlordane	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.1
delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.005
Dieldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Endosulfan sulfate	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Endrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Endrin Aldehyde	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Heptachlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.02
Lindane (gamma-Hexachlorocyclohexane)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1016	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1221	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1232	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1242	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1248	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1254	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1260	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
Toxaphene	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Atrazine	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Bentazon	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Carbofuran	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
2,4-D	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Dalapon	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Dinoseb	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Diquat	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Endothal	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Ethylene Dibromide	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Methoxychlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Molinate (Ordram)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Oxamyl	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Picloram	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Simazine (Princep)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Thiobencarb	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Diazinon <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Chlorpyrifos <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N) <sup>2,5</sup>	mg/L	Grab	--
Flow <sup>2</sup>	MGD	Meter	--
Hardness (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	mg/L	Grab	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
Foaming Agents (MBAS)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Mercury, Methyl	ng/L	Grab	--
Nitrate (as N) <sup>2</sup>	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Nitrite (as N) <sup>2</sup>	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
pH <sup>2</sup>	Std Units	Grab	--
Sulfate	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Sulfide (as S)	mg/L	Grab	--
Sulfite (as SO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	--
Temperature <sup>2</sup>	°C	Grab	--

<sup>1</sup> The reporting levels required in this table for priority pollutant constituents are established based on Section 2.4.2 and Appendix 4 of the SIP.

<sup>2</sup> The Discharger is not required to conduct effluent and receiving water monitoring for constituents that have already been sampled in a given quarter, as required in Table E-4 and Table E-6, except for flow, hardness, pH, and temperature, which shall be conducted concurrently with the effluent and receiving water sampling.

<sup>3</sup> In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.

<sup>4</sup> 24-hour flow proportional or time-weighted composite.

<sup>5</sup> Total ammonia nitrogen (TAN) is the sum of ammonium ion (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and unionized ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>).

## X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

### A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachment D) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.
2. Upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a summary monitoring report. The report shall contain both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year(s).
3. **Compliance Time Schedules.** For compliance time schedules included in the Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board, on or before each compliance due date, the specified document or a written report detailing compliance or noncompliance with the specific date and task. If noncompliance is reported, the Discharger shall state the reasons for noncompliance and include an estimate of the date when the Discharger will be in compliance. The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by letter when it returns to compliance with the compliance time schedule.
4. The Discharger shall report to the Central Valley Water Board any toxic chemical release data it reports to the State Emergency Response Commission within 15 days of reporting the data to the Commission pursuant to section 313 of the "*Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act*" of 1986.

### B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs)

1. The Discharger shall electronically submit SMRs using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program Web site (<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html>). The CIWQS Web site will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event there will be a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.
2. The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this MRP under sections III through IX. The Discharger shall submit monthly SMRs including



the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. SMRs are to include all new monitoring results obtained since the last SMR was submitted. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR.

3. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:

**Table E-10. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule**

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On...	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
Continuous	Permit effective date	All	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Day	Permit effective date	(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.	Submit with monthly SMR
2/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Month	Permit effective date	1 <sup>st</sup> day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling
1/Quarter	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 March 1 April through 30 June 1 July through 30 September 1 October 1 through 31 December	1 May 1 August 1 November 1 February of following year
1/Year	Permit effective date	1 January 1 through 31 December	1 February of following year

4. **Reporting Protocols.** The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable Reporting Level (RL) and the current laboratory's Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 40 C.F.R. part 136.

The Discharger shall report the results of analytical determinations for the presence of chemical constituents in a sample using the following reporting protocols:

- a. Sample results greater than or equal to the RL shall be reported as measured by the laboratory (i.e., the measured chemical concentration in the sample).
- b. Sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL, shall be reported as "Detected, but Not Quantified," or DNQ. The estimated chemical concentration of the sample shall also be reported.

For the purposes of data collection, the laboratory shall write the estimated chemical concentration next to DNQ. The laboratory may, if such information is available, include numerical estimates of the data quality for the reported result. Numerical estimates of data quality may be percent accuracy ( $\pm$  a percentage of the reported value), numerical ranges (low to high), or any other means considered appropriate by the laboratory.

- c. Sample results less than the laboratory's MDL shall be reported as "Not Detected," or ND.
  - d. Dischargers are to instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that the Minimum Level (ML) value (or its equivalent if there is differential treatment of samples relative to calibration standards) is the lowest calibration standard. At no time is the Discharger to use analytical data derived from extrapolation beyond the lowest point of the calibration curve.
- 5. **Multiple Sample Data.** When determining compliance with an AMEL, AWEL, or MDEL for priority pollutants and more than one sample result is available, the Discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of "Detected, but Not Quantified" (DNQ) or "Not Detected" (ND). In those cases, the Discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
  - a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, ranking the reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
  - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
- 6. The Discharger shall submit SMRs in accordance with the following requirements:
  - a. The Discharger shall arrange all reported data in a tabular format. The data shall be summarized to clearly illustrate whether the facility is operating in compliance with interim and/or final effluent limitations. The Discharger is not required to duplicate the submittal of data that is entered in a tabular format within CIWQS. When electronic submittal of data is required and CIWQS does not provide for entry into a tabular format within the system, the Discharger shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.
  - b. The Discharger shall attach a cover letter to the SMR. The information contained in the cover letter shall clearly identify violations of the WDR's; discuss corrective actions taken or planned; and the proposed time schedule for corrective actions. Identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation.
- 7. The Discharger shall submit in the SMRs calculations and reports in accordance with the following requirements:
  - a. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the average dry weather flow for the effluent. The average dry weather flow shall be calculated as specified in Compliance Determination Section VII.B to demonstrate compliance with Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications Section IV.A.1.f and reported in the Annual Operations Report due 1 February of the following year.
  - b. **Mass Loading Limitations.** For BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, and ammonia, the Discharger shall calculate and report the mass loading (lbs/day) in the SMRs. The mass loading shall be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Mass Loading (lbs/day)} = \text{Flow (MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34$$

When calculating daily mass loading, the daily average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For weekly average mass loading, the weekly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For monthly average mass loading, the monthly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used.

- c. **Removal Efficiency (BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS).** The Discharger shall calculate and report the percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS in the SMRs. The percent removal shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.A. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- d. **Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the 7-day median of total coliform organisms for the effluent. The 7-day median of total coliform organisms shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.C of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- e. **Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report monthly in the self-monitoring report: i) the dissolved oxygen concentration, ii) the percent of saturation in the main water mass, and iii) the 95th percentile dissolved oxygen concentration.
- f. **Turbidity Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the turbidity increase in the receiving water applicable to the natural turbidity condition specified in Section V.A.18.a-e. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- g. **Temperature Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the temperature increase in the receiving water based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002.

### C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs)

1. At any time during the term of this permit, the State Water Board or Central Valley Water Board may notify the Discharger to electronically submit DMRs. Until such notification is given specifically for the electronic submittal of DMRs, the Discharger shall submit DMRs in accordance with the requirements described below.
2. DMRs must be signed and certified as required by the standard provisions (Attachment D). The Discharger shall submit the original DMR and one copy of the DMR to the address listed below:

STANDARD MAIL	FEDEX/UPS/ OTHER PRIVATE CARRIERS
State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center PO Box 100 Sacramento, CA 95812-1000	State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center 1001 I Street, 15 <sup>th</sup> Floor Sacramento, CA 95814

3. All discharge monitoring results must be reported on the official U.S. EPA pre-printed DMR forms (EPA Form 3320-1) or on self-generated forms that follow the exact same format of EPA Form 3320-1.

### D. Other Reports

1. The Discharger shall report the results of any special studies, acute and chronic toxicity testing, TRE/TIE, PMP, and Pollution Prevention Plan required by Special Provisions –

VI.C. The Discharger shall submit reports with the first monthly SMR scheduled to be submitted on or immediately following the report due date.

2. **Within 60 days of the permit effective date**, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining reporting levels (RLs), method detection limits, and analytical methods for approval. The Discharger shall comply with the monitoring and reporting requirements for CTR constituents as outlined in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the SIP. The maximum required reporting levels for priority pollutant constituents shall be based on the Minimum Levels (MLs) contained in Appendix 4 of the SIP, determined in accordance with Section 2.4.2 and Section 2.4.3 of the SIP. In accordance with Section 2.4.2 of the SIP, when there is more than one ML value for a given substance, the Central Valley Water Board shall include as RLs, in the permit, all ML values, and their associated analytical methods, listed in Appendix 4 that are below the calculated effluent limitation. The Discharger may select any one of those cited analytical methods for compliance determination. If no ML value is below the effluent limitation, then the Central Valley Water Board shall select as the RL, the lowest ML value, and its associated analytical method, listed in Appendix 4 for inclusion in the permit. Table E-9 (Attachment E) provides required maximum reporting levels in accordance with the SIP.
3. **Annual Operations Report.** By 1 February of each year, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Executive Officer containing the following:
  - a. The names, certificate grades, and general responsibilities of all persons employed at the Facility.
  - b. The names and telephone numbers of persons to contact regarding the plant for emergency and routine situations.
  - c. A statement certifying when the flow meter(s) and other monitoring instruments and devices were last calibrated, including identification of who performed the calibration.
  - d. A statement certifying whether the current operation and maintenance manual, and contingency plan, reflect the wastewater treatment plant as currently constructed and operated, and the dates when these documents were last revised and last reviewed for adequacy.
  - e. The Discharger may also be requested to submit an annual report to the Central Valley Water Board with both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year. Any such request shall be made in writing. The report shall discuss the compliance record. If violations have occurred, the report shall also discuss the corrective actions taken and planned to bring the discharge into full compliance with the waste discharge requirements.

## ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

### Contents

I.	Permit Information.....	F-3
II.	Facility Description .....	F-4
	A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls.....	F-4
	B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters .....	F-4
	C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data .....	F-4
	D. Compliance Summary .....	F-5
	E. Planned Changes – Not Applicable .....	F-7
III.	Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	F-7
	A. Legal Authorities .....	F-7
	B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).....	F-7
	C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans .....	F-7
	D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List.....	F-9
	E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations .....	F-10
IV.	Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications.....	F-11
	A. Discharge Prohibitions.....	F-12
	B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations .....	F-12
	1. Scope and Authority .....	F-12
	2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations .....	F-13
	C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs) .....	F-14
	1. Scope and Authority .....	F-14
	2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives .....	F-14
	3. Determining the Need for WQBELs .....	F-31
	4. WQBEL Calculations.....	F-50
	5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) .....	F-52
	D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations .....	F-54
	1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations .....	F-54
	2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations .....	F-55
	3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements.....	F-55
	4. Antidegradation Policies.....	F-56
	5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.....	F-57
	E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable .....	F-59
	F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable .....	F-59
	G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable .....	F-59
V.	Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations .....	F-59
	A. Surface Water.....	F-59
	B. Groundwater.....	F-61
VI.	Rationale for Provisions .....	F-62
	A. Standard Provisions.....	F-62
	B. Special Provisions .....	F-62
	1. Reopener Provisions.....	F-62
	2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	F-63
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention .....	F-66
	4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications.....	F-66
	5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) .....	F-66
	6. Other Special Provisions .....	F-67
	7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable .....	F-67

VII.	Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements .....	F-67
A.	Influent Monitoring .....	F-67
B.	Effluent Monitoring.....	F-68
C.	Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements .....	F-69
D.	Receiving Water Monitoring.....	F-69
	1. Surface Water .....	F-69
	2. Groundwater – Not Applicable .....	F-70
E.	Other Monitoring Requirements.....	F-70
VIII.	Public Participation .....	F-71
A.	Notification of Interested Parties.....	F-71
B.	Written Comments.....	F-71
C.	Public Hearing .....	F-71
D.	Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements .....	F-71
E.	Information and Copying.....	F-72
F.	Register of Interested Persons .....	F-72
G.	Additional Information .....	F-72

### Tables

Table F-1.	Facility Information .....	F-3
Table F-2.	Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data.....	F-4
Table F-3.	Basin Plan Beneficial Uses.....	F-8
Table F-4.	303 (d) List for the Sacramento River.....	F-10
Table F-5.	Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations .....	F-13
Table F-6.	Critical Dilution Ratios .....	F-17
Table F-7.	Mixing Zone/Dilution Study Results.....	F-18
Table F-8.	Final Dilution Credits .....	F-21
Table F-9.	Site-Specific Translators for Copper and Zinc.....	F-24
Table F-10.	Nickel ECA Evaluation.....	F-28
Table F-11.	Copper ECA Evaluation – Dilution Credit Allowed .....	F-29
Table F-12.	Lead ECA Evaluation .....	F-30
Table F-13.	Summary of ECA Evaluations for CTR Hardness-dependent Metals .....	F-30
Table F-14.	Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives.....	F-32
Table F-15.	Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate Data Summary .....	F-34
Table F-16.	Cadmium RPA Summary .....	F-36
Table F-17.	Cadmium Data Summary .....	F-36
Table F-18.	Copper RPA Summary .....	F-43
Table F-19.	Zinc RPA Summary .....	F-49
Table F-20.	Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-51
Table F-21.	Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results.....	F-53
Table F-22.	Summary of Final Effluent Limitations .....	F-57

## ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

As described in section II.B of this Order, the Central Valley Water Board incorporates this Fact Sheet as findings of the Central Valley Water Board supporting the issuance of this Order. This Fact Sheet includes the legal requirements and technical rationale that serve as the basis for the requirements of this Order.

This Order has been prepared under a standardized format to accommodate a broad range of discharge requirements for Dischargers in California. Only those sections or subsections of this Order that are specifically identified as “not applicable” have been determined not to apply to this Discharger. Sections or subsections of this Order not specifically identified as “not applicable” are fully applicable to this Discharger.

### I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the facility.

**Table F-1. Facility Information**

<b>WDID</b>	5A450100001
<b>Discharger</b>	City of Anderson
<b>Name of Facility</b>	Water Pollution Control Plant
<b>Facility Address</b>	3701 Rupert Road
	Anderson, CA 96007
	Shasta County
<b>Facility Contact, Title and Phone</b>	Phil DeBlasio, Chief Plant Operator, (530) 378-6665
<b>Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports</b>	Jeff Kiser, City Manager, (530) 378-6636
<b>Mailing Address</b>	1887 Howard Street, Anderson, CA 96007
<b>Billing Address</b>	Same as Mailing Address
<b>Type of Facility</b>	Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)
<b>Major or Minor Facility</b>	Major
<b>Threat to Water Quality</b>	1
<b>Complexity</b>	A
<b>Pretreatment Program</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Recycling Requirements</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Facility Permitted Flow</b>	2.0 million gallons per day (MGD), average dry weather flow
<b>Facility Design Flow</b>	2.0 MGD
<b>Watershed</b>	Sacramento-Lower Cow-Lower Clear
<b>Receiving Water</b>	Sacramento River
<b>Receiving Water Type</b>	Inland Surface Water

- A.** The City of Anderson (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of the City of Anderson, Water Pollution Control Plant (hereinafter Facility), a POTW.

For the purposes of this Order, references to the “discharger” or “permittee” in applicable federal and state laws, regulations, plans, or policy are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger herein.

- B.** The Facility discharges wastewater to the Sacramento River, a water of the United States, within the Sacramento-Lower Cow-Lower Clear watershed. The Discharger was previously regulated by Order R5-2007-0167 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0077704 adopted on 6 December 2007 and expired on

1 December 2012. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

Prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. The State Water Board retains the jurisdictional authority to enforce such requirements under Water Code section 1211.

- C. The Discharger filed a report of waste discharge (ROWD) and submitted an application for reissuance of its WDR's and NPDES permit on 1 February 2012. Additional information was received on 23 February 2012, 30 March 2012, and 30 July 2012. The application was deemed complete on 30 July 2012. A site visit was conducted on 16 April 2013 to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and requirements for waste discharge.

## II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the City of Anderson and serves a population of approximately 10,700. The design average dry weather flow of the Facility is 2.0 MGD.

### A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls

The treatment system at the Facility consists of a headworks with one mechanical bar screen, a backup manual screen, a backup comminutor, two activated sludge aeration basins, two secondary clarifiers, one ballast pond to equalize flow to the pressure filters, three pressurized multi-media filtration units, one chlorine contact basin, and sulfur dioxide dechlorination.

Biosolids processing consists of aerobic digestion, pond stabilization, and solar drying. Dried biosolids are disposed at a sanitary landfill and/or land applied on property owned by the City of Redding.

### B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in Section 11, T30N, R4W, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.
2. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point No. 001 to the Sacramento River, a water of the United States at a point latitude 40° 28' 8" N and longitude 122° 16' 45" W.

### C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data

Effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2007-0167 for discharges from Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2007-0167 are as follows:

**Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (January 2008 – December 2013)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Flow	MGD	2.0 <sup>1</sup>	--	--	1.9 <sup>2</sup>	--	--
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>							
Biochemical Oxygen	mg/L	10	15	30	3	9	9



Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (January 2008 – December 2013)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	lbs/day	167	250	500	59	104	104
	% Removal	85	--	--	96.7 <sup>3</sup>	--	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	3.6	7.7	7.7
	lbs/day	167	250	500	30	67	67
	% Removal	85	--	--	97.1 <sup>3</sup>	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	6.0 – 9.0	--	--	6.29 – 7.5
<b>Priority Pollutants</b>							
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	29	--	58.2	3.4	--	5.1
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	43.5	--	87.2	10.7	--	10.7
beta-BHC	µg/L	0.06	--	0.12	<0.002	--	<0.002
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	139	--	279	101	--	101
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>							
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	3.2	--	9.0	1.16	--	1.16
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	--	0.01 <sup>4</sup>	0.02 <sup>5</sup>	--	--	<0.009
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	23 <sup>6</sup>	--	240 <sup>7</sup>	--	--	308
Acute Toxicity	% Survival	--	--	70 <sup>8</sup> /90 <sup>9</sup>	--	--	100 <sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Monthly average daily dry weather discharge flow from May through September.

<sup>2</sup> Represents the maximum observed average daily flow.

<sup>3</sup> Represents the minimum observed percent removal.

<sup>4</sup> Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.

<sup>5</sup> Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.

<sup>6</sup> Applied as a monthly median effluent limitation.

<sup>7</sup> Not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period.

<sup>8</sup> Minimum for any one bioassay.

<sup>9</sup> Median for three consecutive bioassays

<sup>10</sup> Represents the minimum observed percent survival.

#### D. Compliance Summary

1. A Compliance Evaluation Inspection (CEI) was performed on 21 April 2011. Major findings from the inspection include the following:
  - a. Order R5-2007-0167, Attachment E - Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Section IV.A requires reporting for 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>) and orthophosphate. The self-monitoring reports (SMRs) reviewed for January 2011 and March 2011 noted that results were not correctly transferred from the contract laboratory analyses sheets to the electronic self-monitoring report (eSMR) and the

hard copy SMR transmitted to the Central Valley Water Board. None of the reported incorrect values had caused permit limit exceedances.

- b. Order R5-2007-0167, Attachment E - MRP, Section VIII.A requires reporting for total recoverable zinc and electrical conductivity. The SMRs reviewed for January 2011 and March 2011 noted that results were correctly transferred from the contract laboratory analyses sheets to the eSMR for both these constituents; however, the hard copy SMR transmitted to the Central Valley Water Board did not contain the correct results. Neither the reported incorrect value for total recoverable zinc or the omitted value for electrical conductivity had caused a permit limit exceedances.
- c. Order R5-2007-0167, Attachment D - Standard Provisions, Section IV.B requires that records of monitoring information include the date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements; the individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements; the date(s) analyses were performed; and the individual(s) who performed the analyses. The Discharger does not record the time that receiving water samples (pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and temperature) are collected or the name of the person performing the collection of samples. In addition, the Discharger does not record the time that the receiving water samples (pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and temperature) are analyzed at the on-site laboratory or record the person who performed the analyses.
- d. Order R5-2007-0167, Attachment E - MRP, Table E-1 describes Monitoring Location INF- 001 as the "*Treatment Plant Headworks*". Further, Table E-2 requires the Discharger to continuously monitor influent flow at Monitoring Location INF-001. The flow measurement device used for the influent flow is located between the secondary clarifiers and the ballast pond and does not comply with the monitoring station location description in the permit. The reported influent flow to the Facility taken at this location may not be representative of the actual influent inflow as the activated sludge is returned to the headworks prior to the influent flow meter.
- e. Order R5-2007-0167, Attachment E - MRP, Section I.B requires the Discharger to institute a Quality Assurance-Quality Control (QA/QC) Program for analyses conducted at the on-site noncertified laboratory. A manual containing the steps followed in this program must be kept in the laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Central Valley Water Board staff. The QA/QC Program must conform to U.S. EPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Central Valley Water Board. The Discharger has not developed a QA/QC program or laboratory standard operating procedures (SOPs) for analyses conducted at the on-site laboratory. The Discharger does not maintain laboratory bench sheets for the effluent pH and receiving water parameters (pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and temperature) other than the final results submitted on the SMRs. The Facility representative stated that the results are written on a piece of paper at the time of analysis and this paper is discarded after the results are transferred to the final SMR. It was not possible to determine if holding times were being met.
- f. Order R5-2007-0167, Attachment D - Standard Provisions, Provision III.B requires monitoring to be performed in accordance to procedures specified in 40 CFR Part 136. Accordingly, samples for pH must be analyzed within 15 minutes of sample collection. No records for pH collection time and analyses time were available to verify that analyses for pH were performed within 15 minutes of collection. In addition, it was not possible to determine if on-site monitoring results for pH and other receiving water parameters were properly transferred to the final SMR.

2. A CEI was performed on 19 February 2013. Major findings from the inspection include the following:
  - a. Order R5-2007-0167, Attachment E – MRP, Table E-1 describes Monitoring Location INF-001 as the “*Treatment plant headworks*.” Further, Attachment E – MRP, Table E-2 requires the Discharger to continuously monitor influent flow at Monitoring Location INF-001. The flow measurement device used to measure the influent flow is located between the secondary clarifiers and a ballast pond and does not comply with the Monitoring Location INF-001 description in the permit.
  - b. A result sheet submitted by Basic Laboratory for a sample collected on 1 November 2012 contained a result for total phosphorous of 4.35 mg/L and a result for orthophosphate of 4.26 mg/L. The Discharger transposed the two results on both the eSMR and hard copy SMR, reporting a result of 4.26 mg/L for total phosphorous and 4.35 mg/L for orthophosphate.

**E. Planned Changes – Not Applicable**

**III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

The requirements contained in this Order are based on the requirements and authorities described in this section.

**A. Legal Authorities**

This Order serves as WDR’s pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters.

**B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of CEQA, (commencing with section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code.

**C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans**

1. **Water Quality Control Plan.** Requirements of this Order specifically implement the applicable Water Quality Control Plans.
  - a. **Basin Plan.** The Central Valley Water Board adopted a Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised October 2011), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. Requirements in this Order implement the Basin Plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Beneficial uses applicable to the Sacramento River are as follows:

**Table F-3. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses**

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Sacramento River (Shasta Dam to Colusa Basin Drain)	<u>Existing:</u> Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural supply, including irrigation and stock watering (AGR); industrial service supply (IND); industrial power supply (POW); water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting (REC-1); non-contact water recreation (REC-2); warm freshwater habitat (WARM); cold freshwater habitat (COLD); migration of aquatic organisms, warm and cold (MIGR); spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, warm and cold (SPWN); wildlife habitat (WILD); and navigation (NAV).

2. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** U.S. EPA adopted the NTR on 22 December 1992, and later amended it on 4 May 1995 and 9 November 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On 18 May 2000, U.S. EPA adopted the CTR. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition, incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on 13 February 2001. These rules contain federal water quality criteria for priority pollutants.
3. **State Implementation Policy.** On 2 March 2000, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on 28 April 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the U.S. EPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Central Valley Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on 18 May 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the U.S. EPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on 24 February 2005, that became effective on 13 July 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.
4. **Antidegradation Policy.** Federal regulation 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution 68-16 ("Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California"). Resolution 68-16 is deemed to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Central Valley Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the State and federal antidegradation policies. The permitted discharge must be consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.
5. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l) restrict backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed.
6. **Domestic Water Quality.** In compliance with Water Code section 106.3, it is the policy of the State of California that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable,

and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. This Order promotes that policy by requiring discharges to meet maximum contaminant levels designed to protect human health and ensure that water is safe for domestic use.

7. **Endangered Species Act Requirements.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code, §§ 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. §§ 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. The Discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.
8. **Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act.** Section 13263.6(a) of the Water Code, requires that *“the Regional Water Board shall prescribe effluent limitations as part of the waste discharge requirements of a POTW for all substances that the most recent toxic chemical release data reported to the state emergency response commission pursuant to Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 11023) (EPCRA) indicate as discharged into the POTW, for which the State Water Board or the Regional Water Board has established numeric water quality objectives, and has determined that the discharge is or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to, an excursion above any numeric water quality objective”*.

The most recent toxic chemical data report does not indicate any reportable off-site releases or discharges to the collection system for this Facility. Therefore, an reasonable potential analysis (RPA) based on information from EPCRA cannot be conducted. Based on information from EPCRA, there is no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above any numeric water quality objectives included within the Basin Plan or in any State Water Board plan, so no effluent limitations are included in this permit pursuant to Water Code section 13263.6(a).

However, as detailed elsewhere in this Order, available effluent data indicate that there are constituents present in the effluent that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality standards and require inclusion of effluent limitations based on federal and state laws and regulations.

9. **Storm Water Requirements.** U.S. EPA promulgated federal regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater treatment plants are applicable industries under the storm water program and are obligated to comply with the federal regulations. The State Water Board Water Quality Order No. 97-03-DWQ, NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities Excluding Construction Activities, does not require facilities to obtain coverage if storm water is captured and treated and/or disposed of with the Facility's NPDES permitted process wastewater or if storm water is disposed of in evaporation ponds, percolation ponds, or combined sewer systems. The Discharger captures and treats all storm water that falls on-site. Therefore, coverage under the General Storm Water Permit is not required.

#### **D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List**

1. Under section 303(d) of the 1972 CWA, states, territories and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments. The waters on these lists do

not meet water quality standards, even after point sources of pollution have installed the minimum required levels of pollution control technology. On 11 October 2011 U.S. EPA gave final approval to California's 2008-2010 section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. The Basin Plan references this list of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs), which are defined as "...those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 CFR Part 130, et seq.)." The Basin Plan also states, "Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLSs]. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment." The listing for the Sacramento River from Keswick Dam to Cottonwood Creek includes unknown toxicity.

2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).** U.S. EPA requires the Central Valley Water Board to develop TMDLs for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body combination. Table F-4, below, identifies the 303(d) listings and the status of each TMDL.

**Table F-4. 303 (d) List for the Sacramento River**

Pollutant	Potential Sources	Proposed TMDL Completion <sup>1</sup>
Unknown Toxicity	Source Unknown	(2019)

<sup>1</sup> Dates in parentheses are proposed TMDL completion dates.

In 2007, the Central Valley Water Board adopted an amendment to the Basin Plan that addressed impairments within the Sacramento River and Feather River Basins by promulgating a water quality objective for diazinon and chlorpyrifos as well as an implementation program designed to ensure compliance with the new water quality objective. Per this implementation program, all NPDES permits for discharges (both direct and indirect) to the Sacramento or Feather Rivers must contain an effluent limit equivalent to the diazinon and chlorpyrifos water quality objective. This Order requires the Discharger to monitor the effluent for diazinon and chlorpyrifos, and includes effluent limitations for diazinon and chlorpyrifos.

3. The 303(d) listings and TMDLs have been considered in the development of the Order. A pollutant-by-pollutant evaluation of each pollutant of concern is described in section VI.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

#### **E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations**

1. **Title 27.** The discharge authorized herein and the treatment and storage facilities associated with the discharge of treated municipal wastewater, except for discharges of residual sludge and solid waste, are exempt from the requirements of Title 27, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 20005 *et seq* (hereafter Title 27). The exemption, pursuant to Title 27 CCR section 20090(a), is based on the following:
  - a. The waste consists primarily of domestic sewage and treated effluent;
  - b. The waste discharge requirements are consistent with water quality objectives; and
  - c. The treatment and storage facilities described herein are associated with a municipal wastewater treatment plant.
2. **Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program.** Under the authority of section 308 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. § 1318), U.S. EPA requires major and selected minor permittees under the NPDES Program to participate in the annual DMR-QA Study Program. The DMR-QA Study evaluates the analytical ability of laboratories that routinely perform or support self-monitoring analyses required by NPDES permits.

There are two options to satisfy the requirements of the DMR-QA Study Program: (1) the Discharger can obtain and analyze a DMR-QA sample as part of the DMR-QA Study; or (2) per the waiver issued by U.S. EPA to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), the Discharger can submit the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study from their own laboratories or their contract laboratories. A Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study is similar to the DMR-QA Study. Thus, it also evaluates a laboratory's ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES Program. The Discharger shall submit annually the results of the DMR-QA Study or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to the State Water Board. The State Water Board's Quality Assurance Program Officer will send the DMR-QA Study results or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to U.S. EPA's DMR-QA Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager.

#### IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

Effluent limitations and toxic and pretreatment effluent standards established pursuant to sections 301 (Effluent Limitations), 302 (Water Quality Related Effluent Limitations), 304 (Information and Guidelines), and 307 (Toxic and Pretreatment Effluent Standards) of the CWA and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.

The CWA mandates the implementation of effluent limitations that are as stringent as necessary to meet water quality standards established pursuant to state or federal law [33 U.S.C., §1311(b)(1)(C); 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)]. NPDES permits must incorporate discharge limits necessary to ensure that water quality standards are met. This requirement applies to narrative criteria as well as to criteria specifying maximum amounts of particular pollutants. Pursuant to federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i), NPDES permits must contain limits that control all pollutants that *"are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality."* Federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi), further provide that *"[w]here a state has not established a water quality criterion for a specific chemical pollutant that is present in an effluent at a concentration that causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above a narrative criterion within an applicable State water quality standard, the permitting authority must establish effluent limits."*

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations: 40 CFR 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 CFR 122.44(d) requires that permits include WQBELs to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water where numeric water quality objectives have not been established. The Basin Plan at page IV-17.00, contains an implementation policy, "Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives", that specifies that the Central Valley Water Board *"will, on a case-by-case basis, adopt numerical limitations in orders which will implement the narrative objectives."* This Policy complies with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1). With respect to narrative objectives, the Central Valley Water Board must establish effluent limitations using one or more of three specified sources, including: (1) U.S. EPA's published water quality criteria, (2) a proposed state criterion (i.e., water quality objective) or an explicit state policy interpreting its narrative water quality criteria (i.e., the Central Valley Water Board's "Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives") (40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(A), (B) or (C)), or (3) an indicator parameter.

The Basin Plan includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, discoloration, radionuclides, and tastes and odors. The narrative toxicity objective states: “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at III-8.00) The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The narrative chemical constituents objective states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At minimum, “...*water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)*” in Title 22 of CCR. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Central Valley Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs. The narrative tastes and odors objective states: “*Water shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.*”

#### **A. Discharge Prohibitions**

1. **Prohibition III.A (No discharge or application of waste other than that described in this Order).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13260 that requires filing of a ROWD before discharges can occur. The Discharger submitted a ROWD for the discharges described in this Order; therefore, discharges not described in this Order are prohibited.
2. **Prohibition III.B (No bypasses or overflow of untreated wastewater, except under the conditions at CFR Part 122.41(m)(4)).** As stated in section I.G of Attachment D, Standard Provisions, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the treatment facility. Federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m), define “bypass” as the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. This section of the federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m)(4), prohibits bypass unless it is unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage. In considering the Regional Water Board’s prohibition of bypasses, the State Water Board adopted a precedential decision, Order No. WQO 2002-0015, which cites the federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation.
3. **Prohibition III.C (No controllable condition shall create a nuisance).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13050 that requires water quality objectives established for the prevention of nuisance within a specific area. The Basin Plan prohibits conditions that create a nuisance.
4. **Prohibition III.D (No inclusion of pollutant free wastewater shall cause improper operation of the Facility’s systems).** This prohibition is based on 40 CFR Part 122.41 et seq. that requires the proper design and operation of treatment facilities.

#### **B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations**

##### **1. Scope and Authority**

Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing U.S. EPA permit regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44 require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The discharge authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on Secondary Treatment Standards at 40 C.F.R. Part 133.



Regulations promulgated in 40 C.F.R. section 125.3(a)(1) require technology-based effluent limitations for municipal Dischargers to be placed in NPDES permits based on Secondary Treatment Standards or Equivalent to Secondary Treatment Standards.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500) established the minimum performance requirements for POTWs [defined in section 304(d)(1)]. Section 301(b)(1)(B) of that Act requires that such treatment works must, as a minimum, meet effluent limitations based on secondary treatment as defined by the U.S. EPA Administrator.

Based on this statutory requirement, U.S. EPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 40 C.F.R. part 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all municipal wastewater treatment plants and identify the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment in terms of BOD<sub>5</sub>, total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

## 2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

- a. **BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS.** Federal regulations, 40 CFR Part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. This Order establishes WQBELs that are equal to or more stringent than the secondary technology-based treatment described in 40 CFR Part 133 and are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream. (See section IV.C.3.c of this Attachment for the discussion on WQBELs for pathogens). In addition, 40 CFR 133.102, in describing the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, states that the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS over each calendar month.
- b. **Flow.** The Facility was designed to provide an advanced-secondary level of treatment for up to a design flow of 2.0 MGD. Therefore, this Order contains an average dry weather discharge flow effluent limit of 2.0 MGD.
- c. **pH.** The secondary treatment regulations at 40 CFR Part 133 also require that pH be maintained between 6.0 and 9.0 standard units.

### Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations Discharge Point 001

**Table F-5. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Flow	MGD	--	--	2.0 <sup>1</sup>	--	--
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C) <sup>2</sup>	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	500	750	--	--	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--
pH <sup>2</sup>	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0
Total Suspended Solids <sup>2</sup>	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	500	750	--	--	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum

<sup>1</sup> The average dry weather flow shall not exceed 2.0 MGD.

<sup>2</sup> More stringent WQBELs are applicable to the discharge and are included in this Order, as described further in section IV.C.3.c of this Fact Sheet.

<sup>3</sup> Based upon an average dry weather flow of 2.0 MGD.

## C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

### 1. Scope and Authority

CWA Section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as a technology equivalence requirement, more stringent than secondary treatment requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of advanced-secondary treatment or equivalent requirements, is discussed in section IV.C.3.c of this Fact Sheet.

Section 122.44(d)(1)(i) of 40 C.F.R. requires that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, WQBELs must be established using: (1) U.S. EPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), supplemented where necessary by other relevant information; (2) an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern; or (3) a calculated numeric water quality criterion, such as a proposed state criterion or policy interpreting the state's narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information, as provided in section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBELs when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of the receiving water as specified in the Basin Plan, and achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria that are contained in other state plans and policies, or any applicable water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR.

### 2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply.

The Basin Plan on page II-1.00 states: "*Protection and enhancement of existing and potential beneficial uses are primary goals of water quality planning...*" and with respect to disposal of wastewaters states that "*...disposal of wastewaters is [not] a prohibited use of waters of the State; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses.*"

The federal CWA section 101(a)(2), states: "*it is the national goal that wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and for recreation in and on the water be achieved by July 1, 1983.*" Federal Regulations, developed to implement the

requirements of the CWA, create a rebuttable presumption that all waters be designated as fishable and swimmable. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR sections 131.2 and 131.10, require that all waters of the State regulated to protect the beneficial uses of public water supply, protection and propagation of fish, shell fish and wildlife, recreation in and on the water, agricultural, industrial and other purposes including navigation. Section 131.3(e), 40 CFR, defines existing beneficial uses as those uses actually attained after 28 November 1975, whether or not they are included in the water quality standards. Federal Regulation, 40 CFR section 131.10 requires that uses be obtained by implementing effluent limitations, requires that all downstream uses be protected and states that in no case shall a state adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a beneficial use for any waters of the United States.

- a. **Receiving Water and Beneficial Uses.** Refer to III.C.1. above for a complete description of the receiving water and beneficial uses.
- b. **Effluent and Ambient Background Data.** The reasonable potential analysis (RPA), as described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, was based on data from January 2011 through December 2013, which includes effluent and ambient background data submitted in SMRs and the ROWD.
- c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone.** The ROWD included four technical memorandums (i.e., Field Dye Study and Modeling Results Update, Biological Assessment, Translator Study, Water Quality Impact Analysis) and monitoring data to support mixing zones and dilution credits for those constituents requiring final effluent limitations in order to meet applicable water quality objectives and which the Discharger could demonstrate immediate compliance. Mixing zones and dilution credits for compliance with aquatic life and human health water quality criteria are included in this Order for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate plus nitrite, and zinc.
  - i. **Regulatory Guidance for Dilution Credits and Mixing Zones.** The Central Valley Water Board has discretion to accept or deny mixing zones and dilution credits. The CWA directs states to adopt water quality standards to protect the quality of its waters. U.S. EPA's current water quality standards regulation authorizes states to adopt general policies, such as mixing zones, to implement state water quality standards (40 CFR section 122.44 and section 122.45). The U.S. EPA allows states to have broad flexibility in designing its mixing zone policies. Primary policy and guidance on determining mixing zone and dilution credits is provided by the SIP and the Basin Plan. If no procedure applies in the SIP or the Basin Plan, then the Central Valley Water Board may use the U.S. EPA *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control* (EPA/505/2 - 90 - 001) (TSD).

For non-priority pollutant constituents the allowance of mixing zones by the Central Valley Water Board is discussed in the Basin Plan, Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives, which states in part, *"In conjunction with the issuance of NPDES and storm water permits, the Regional Board may designate mixing zones within which water quality objectives will not apply provided the discharger has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Board that the mixing zone will not adversely impact beneficial uses. If allowed, different mixing zones may be designated for different types of objectives, including, but not limited to, acute aquatic life objectives, chronic aquatic life objectives, human health objectives, and acute and chronic whole effluent toxicity objectives, depending in part on the averaging period over*

*which the objectives apply. In determining the size of such mixing zones, the Regional Board will consider the applicable procedures and guidelines in the EPA's Water Quality Standards Handbook and the [TSD]. Pursuant to EPA guidelines, mixing zones designated for acute aquatic life objectives will generally be limited to a small zone of initial dilution in the immediate vicinity of the discharge."*

For priority pollutants, the SIP supersedes the Basin Plan mixing zone provisions. Section 1.4.2 of the SIP states, in part, "...with the exception of effluent limitations derived from TMDLs, in establishing and determining compliance with effluent limitations for applicable human health, acute aquatic life, or chronic aquatic life priority pollutant criteria/objectives or the toxicity objective for aquatic life protection in a basin plan, the Regional Board may grant mixing zones and dilution credits to dischargers...The applicable priority pollutant criteria and objectives are to be met through a water body except within any mixing zone granted by the Regional Board. **The allowance of mixing zones is discretionary and shall be determined on a discharge-by-discharge basis.** The Regional Board may consider allowing mixing zones and dilution credits only for discharges with a physically identifiable point of discharge that is regulated through an NPDES permit issued by the Regional Board." [emphasis added]

For completely-mixed discharges, the Central Valley Water Board may grant a mixing zone and apply a dilution credit in accordance with Section 1.4.2.1 of the SIP. For incompletely-mixed discharges, the Discharger must complete an independent mixing zone study to demonstrate to the Central Valley Water Board that a dilution credit is appropriate. In granting a mixing zone, Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP requires the following to be met:

**"A mixing zone shall be as small as practicable.** The following conditions must be met in allowing a mixing zone: [ emphasis added]

A: A mixing zone shall not:

1. compromise the integrity of the entire water body;
2. cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone;
3. restrict the passage of aquatic life;
4. adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under federal or State endangered species laws;
5. produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life;
6. result in floating debris, oil, or scum;
7. produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity;
8. cause objectionable bottom deposits;
9. cause nuisance;
10. dominate the receiving water body or overlap a mixing zone from different outfalls; or
11. be allowed at or near any drinking water intake. A mixing zone is not a source of drinking water. To the extent of any conflict between this determination and the Sources of Drinking Water Policy (Resolution No. 88-63), this SIP supersedes the provisions of that policy."

Section 1.4.2.1 of the SIP establishes the authority for the Central Valley Water Board to consider dilution credits based on the mixing zone conditions in a receiving water. Section 1.4.2.1 in part states:

*“The dilution credit, D, is a numerical value associated with the mixing zone that accounts for the receiving water entrained into the discharge. The dilution credit is a value used in the calculation of effluent limitations (described in Section 1.4). **Dilution credits may be limited or denied on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis, which may result in a dilution credit for all, some, or no priority pollutants in the discharge.**”* [emphasis added]

- ii. **Dilution/Mixing Zone from Order R5-2007-0167.** Order R5-2007-0167 granted a 200 foot mixing zone and dilution credits for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc. The mixing zone and dilution credits were based on a 31 March 2006 Mixing Zone Study and a 27 January 2006 Dye Study submitted by the Discharger, and requirements specified in Section 1.4 of the SIP. The Mixing Zone Study utilized the numeric Cornell Mixing Zone Expert System (CORMIX) computer model to calculate dilution of effluent downstream from the point of discharge into the receiving water. The Discharger performed the in-field Dye Study to provide a comparison to the modeling results. As a result, dilutions credits of 9, 22, and 110 were granted by the Central Valley Water Board for acute aquatic life, chronic aquatic life, and human health criteria, respectively.

The 2006 Mixing Zone Study was based on critical effluent flows and critical receiving water flows for combined data from Keswick Dam in Redding (Station No. 11370500) and Clear Creek approximately 10 miles before its confluence with the Sacramento River (Station No. 11372000). The Discharger reviewed data from these stations based on current operating agreements and historical flow data. The Discharger also made adjustments for withdrawals by the Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District upstream of the discharge. Information provided in the 2006 Mixing Zone Study is provided in the table below.

**Table F-6. Critical Dilution Ratios**

Criterion	Critical Receiving Water Flow (cfs)	Discharge Effluent Flow (MGD)	Dilution Ratio <sup>1</sup> (if completely-mixed)
Acute	2,847 (1Q10)	6.0 <sup>2</sup> (Maximum Daily)	475:1
Chronic	2,934 (7Q10)	2.0 <sup>3</sup> (4-day average)	1,467:1
Human Health	7,549 (Harmonic mean)	1.4 <sup>4</sup> (Long-term arithmetic mean)	5,392:1

<sup>1</sup> These dilution ratios are not applicable in determining actual, available dilution credits due to incomplete mixing conditions in the receiving water at, and immediately downstream of, the facility effluent outfall.

<sup>2</sup> Based on the facility design maximum wet weather effluent flow capacity.

<sup>3</sup> Based on the facility design maximum dry weather effluent flow.

<sup>4</sup> Based on monthly average dry weather effluent flow.

Order R5-2007-0167 required the Discharger to submit a dilution credit justification update that includes an analysis of dilution ratios for specific criteria analyzing both design and observed effluent flow data.

- iii. **Diffuser Configuration.** The Facility effluent outfall multi-port diffuser extends under the surface water, approximately 30 feet northward from the south bank of the Sacramento River. The river channel width at the outfall location is not less than 359 feet at any receiving water flow level. The diffuser consists of an

18 inch (outside diameter) steel pipe with six 8-inch torch-cut holes (or ports) facing downstream and a seventh similarly sized hole at the end of the pipe pointed northward toward the middle of the river. Fifteen feet from the end of the pipe is visibly exposed from the channel bottom and is where the ports are located. There are approximately 5 to 7 inches in width between each port. The outfall was designed in 1972 and has been in service after construction in 1974.

- iv. **Update to 2006 Dilution/Mixing Zone Study Results.** During the term of the last permit cycle, the Discharger provided an update to the 2006 Mixing Zone Study with dilution delineations from 5 to 800 feet. The Discharger also provided a Biological Evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources as a result of a mixing zone. The Biological Evaluation concluded that a mixing zone up to 300 feet was protective of aquatic life. California Department of Fish and Wildlife reviewed the Biological Evaluation and concurred with the findings of the Biological Evaluation.

A subset of the results presented in the Discharger's Mixing Zone Study Update, and referenced in this Order, are summarized in the table below:

**Table F-7. Mixing Zone/Dilution Study Results**

Distance Downstream (ft.)	Dilution Factor		
	Acute <sup>1</sup>	Chronic	Human Health
10	5.2	13.9	38.8
30	5.7	14.9	54.8
200	9.4	22.2	110.2
300	10.7	25.6	132.1

- v. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Acute and Chronic Aquatic Life Criteria.** U.S. EPA Region VIII, in its "EPA Region VIII Mixing Zones and Dilution Policy", recommends no dilution for acute aquatic life criteria, stating the following, "*In incomplete mix situations, discharge limitations to implement acute chemical-specific aquatic life criteria and narrative (no acute toxicity) criteria shall be based on achieving such acute criteria at the end-of-pipe (i.e., without an allowance for dilution). This approach is intended to implement the narrative requirement prohibiting acutely toxic conditions in the mixing zone.*" The Discharger has been granted acute and chronic mixing zones for compliance with acute and chronic aquatic-life water quality criteria for ammonia, copper, and zinc. Based on the results of the update to the 2006 Mixing Zone Study, the largest acute aquatic-life mixing zone under evaluation is 300 feet and the largest chronic aquatic-life mixing zone is less than 10 feet (see Table F-7 above).

The acute and chronic aquatic-life mixing zones of 300 feet and less than 10 feet, respectively, downstream of the diffuser meet the requirements of the SIP as follows:

- (a) *Shall not compromise the integrity of the entire waterbody* - The TSD states that, "*If the total area affected by elevated concentrations within all mixing zones combined is small compared to the total area of a waterbody (such as a river segment), then mixing zones are likely to have little effect on the integrity of the waterbody as a whole, provided that the mixing zone*

*does not impinge on unique or critical habitats.*" The Sacramento River is approximately 380 feet wide at the diffuser. The largest aquatic-life mixing zone of 300 feet is less than 20 feet wide near the diffuser outfall and is estimated to be less than 80 feet wide at the furthest downstream edge of the mixing zone. The mixing zones are small relative to the waterbody and do not compromise the integrity of the entire waterbody.

- (b) *Shall not cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone* – The SIP requires that the acute mixing zone be appropriately sized to prevent lethality to organisms passing through the mixing zone. U.S. EPA recommends that float times through a mixing zone less than 15 minutes ensures that there will not be lethality to passing organisms. The acute mixing zone allowed in this Order extends 300 feet downstream from the diffuser. The float time at critical low receiving water flow conditions is less than 2.0 minutes<sup>1</sup>. In addition, this Order includes an acute toxicity effluent limitation that requires compliance to be determined based on acute bioassays using 100% effluent. Compliance with these requirements ensures that acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the acute and chronic mixing zones do not occur.
- (c) *Shall not restrict the passage of aquatic life* – The Discharger conducted a mixing zone study to evaluate the near-field effects of the discharge. The Discharger evaluated the zone of passage around the mixing zone where water quality objectives are met. The result of the mixing zone study indicates there is an adequate zone of passage for aquatic life that is at least 79 percent of the width (approximately 300 feet<sup>1</sup>) of the Sacramento River.
- (d) *Shall not adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under federal or State endangered species laws* – The acute and chronic mixing zones will not cause acutely toxic conditions, they allow for an adequate zone of passage, and are sized appropriately to ensure that there will be no adverse impacts to biologically sensitive or critical habitats.
- (e) *Shall not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life; result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; cause nuisance* – The current discharge has not been shown to result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; or cause nuisance. This Order requires the discharge meets advanced-secondary treatment standards, which will ensure continued compliance with these mixing zone requirements. With these requirements the acute and chronic mixing zones will not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life, result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; or cause nuisance.
- (f) *Shall not dominate the receiving water body or overlap a mixing zone from different outfalls* – The acute and chronic mixing zones are small relative to the water body, so it will not dominate the water body. The outfall is

---

<sup>1</sup> Assuming a current velocity of approximately 2.6 feet per second at critical low flow conditions (2850 cfs) [18 July 2012 Technical Memorandum No.2 – Biological Assessment, Kennedy/Jenks Consultants]

located less than 1 mile upstream of the City of Redding's Stillwater Wastewater Treatment Facility effluent outfall diffuser; however, the proposed mixing zones do not overlap with the mixing zones from the downstream outfall. There are no other outfalls or mixing zones in the vicinity of the discharge.

- (g) *Shall not be allowed at or near any drinking water intake* – The acute and chronic mixing zones are not near a drinking water intake.

- vi. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Human Health Criteria.** Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP, provides that mixing zones should not be allowed at or near drinking water intakes. Furthermore, regarding the application of a mixing zone for protection of human health, the TSD states that, "...*the presence of mixing zones should not result in significant health risks, when evaluated using reasonable assumptions about exposure pathways. Thus, where drinking water contaminants are a concern, mixing zones should not encroach on drinking water intakes.*" There are no drinking water intakes in the human health mixing zone. The Discharger has been granted a human health mixing zone for compliance with human health water quality criteria for chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, and nitrate plus nitrite.

Based on the results of the Mixing Zone Study, the largest human health mixing zone granted is 30 feet (see table below). The width of the each human health mixing zone is less than 10 feet. The human health criteria mixing zone meets the requirements of the SIP as follows:

- (a) *Shall not compromise the integrity of the entire waterbody* - The TSD states that, "*If the total area affected by elevated concentrations within all mixing zones combined is small compared to the total area of a waterbody (such as a river segment), then mixing zones are likely to have little effect on the integrity of the waterbody as a whole, provided that the mixing zone does not impinge on unique or critical habitats.*" The human health mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. The human health mixing zone does not compromise the integrity of the entire waterbody.
- (b) *Shall not cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone* – The human health mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. Therefore, acutely toxic conditions will not occur in the mixing zone.
- (c) *Shall not restrict the passage of aquatic life* – The human health mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. Therefore, the mixing zone will not restrict the passage of aquatic life.
- (d) *Shall not adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under federal or State end angered species laws* – The human health mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. The mixing zone will not impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats.
- (e) *Shall not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life; result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; cause nuisance* – The allowance of a human health mixing zone will not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life, result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable



color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; or cause nuisance.

- (f) *Shall not dominate the receiving water body or overlap a mixing zone from different outfalls* – The human health mixing zone is small relative to the water body, so it will not dominate the water body. Furthermore, the mixing zone does not overlap mixing zones from other outfalls.
  - (g) *Shall not be allowed at or near any drinking water intake* – There are no drinking water intakes within the human health mixing zone.
- vii. **Final Dilution Credits.** The final dilution credits and associated mixing zones lengths for each pollutant receiving dilution credit(s) are summarized in the table below. The dilution credits allowed in this Order are in accordance with Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP and are a discretionary act by the Central Valley Water Board.

**Table F-8. Final Dilution Credits**

Parameter	Units	Dilution Credit			Mixing Zone/Distance Downstream (ft.)		
		Acute	Chronic	Human Health	Acute	Chronic	Human Health
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	9.4	2	--	200	<10	--
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	--	--	38.8	--	--	10
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	10.7	10	--	300	<10	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	--	--	54.8	--	--	30
Nitrate plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	--	--	3	--	--	<10
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	10.7	--	--	300	--	--

- viii. **Regulatory Compliance for Dilution Credits and Mixing Zones.** To fully comply with all applicable laws, regulations and policies of the State, Central Valley Water Board approved a mixing zone and the associated dilution credits shown in the table above based on the following:
- (a) Mixing zones are allowed under the SIP provided all elements contained in Section 1.4.2.2 are met. Based on the mixing zone study conducted by the Discharger the Central Valley Water Board has determined that these factors are met.
  - (b) Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP requires mixing zones to be as small as practicable. Based on the mixing zone study conducted by the Discharger the Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zone is as small as practicable.
  - (c) In accordance with Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP, the Board has determined the mixing zone is as small as practicable, will not compromise the integrity of the entire water body, restrict the passage of aquatic life, dominate the water body or overlap existing mixing zones from different outfalls. The mixing zones are small relative to the large size of the receiving water, are not at or near a drinking water intake, and do not overlap a mixing zone from a different out fall.
  - (d) The Central Valley Water Board is allowing a mixing zone for acute aquatic-life, chronic aquatic-life, and human health constituents and has determined allowing such mixing zones will not cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone.

- (e) The Central Valley Water Board has determined the discharge will not adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under the federal or State endangered species laws. The discharge will not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life, result in floating debris, oil, or scum, produce objectionable odor, taste, or turbidity, cause objectionable bottom deposits, or cause nuisance, because the proposed Order establishes end-of-pipe effluent limitations (e.g., for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS) and discharge prohibitions to prevent these conditions from occurring.
- (f) As required by the SIP, in determining the extent of or whether to allow a mixing zone and dilution credit, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the presence of pollutants in the discharge that are carcinogenic, mutagenic, teratogenic, persistent, bioaccumulative, or attractive to aquatic organisms, and concluded that the allowance of the mixing zone and dilution credit is adequately protective of the beneficial uses of the receiving water.
- (g) The Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zones comply with the SIP for priority pollutants.
- (h) The Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zone complies with the Basin Plan for non-priority pollutants (i.e., nitrate and pH). The Basin Plan requires a mixing zone not adversely impact beneficial uses. Beneficial uses will not be adversely affected for the same reasons discussed above. In determining the size of the mixing zone, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the procedures and guidelines in Section 5.1 of U.S. EPA's Water Quality Standards Handbook, 2nd Edition (updated July 2007) and Section 2.2.2 of the TSD. The SIP incorporates the same guidelines.
- (i) The Central Valley Water Board has determined based on the current facility, discharge and receiving water data and characteristics considered for this Order that allowing dilution factors that exceed those proposed by this Order would not comply with the State Anti-degradation Policy for receiving waters outside the allowable mixing zone for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate plus nitrite, and zinc. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy and requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. Item 2 of Resolution 68-16 states:  
  
*"Any activity which produces or may produce a waste or increased volume or concentration of waste and which dischargers or proposed to discharge to existing high quality waters will be required to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained."*  
  
If the facility performance, treatment or characteristics of the discharge or receiving water should change, this Order provides a reopener to allow the Board to reconsider and revise the dilution factors granted, including increasing the allowed dilution credit if necessary.

The effluent limitations established in the Order for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate plus nitrite, and zinc, that have been adjusted for dilution credits provided in the table above, were developed based on performance of the Discharger's current wastewater treatment capabilities. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board determined the effluent limitations required by this Order will result in the Discharger implementing best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that pollution or nuisance will not occur and the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained. The Central Valley Water Board also determined the Discharger will be in immediate compliance with the effluent limitations.

The Central Valley Water Board also determined establishing effluent limitations for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate plus nitrite, and zinc, that have been adjusted for dilution credits provided in the table above, are consistent with Section 1.4.2.2B of the SIP that requires the Central Valley Water Board to deny or significantly limit a mixing zone and dilution credits as necessary to comply with other regulatory requirements.

- (j) Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board has determined the effluent limitations established in the Order for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate plus nitrite, and zinc, that have been adjusted for dilution credits provided in the table above, are appropriate and comply with the Basin Plan, SIP, Federal anti-degradation regulations and Resolution 68-16.
- d. **Conversion Factors.** The CTR contains aquatic life criteria for arsenic, cadmium, chromium III, chromium VI, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc which are presented in dissolved concentrations. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. For priority pollutant metals, the SIP requires the use of U.S. EPA conversion factors contained in Appendix 3 to convert the applicable dissolved criteria to total recoverable criteria. Alternatively, the SIP allows the use of site-specific metals translators that *"...can be developed from field data by either direct determination of the fraction dissolved, or by development of a site-specific partition coefficient that relates the fraction dissolved to ambient background conditions such as pH, suspended load, or organic carbon."*

Order R5-2007-0167 allowed site-specific metals translators for copper and zinc based on a 2007 translator study conducted for the City of Redding, Stillwater Wastewater Treatment Facility, which discharges to the Sacramento River approximately 3,000 feet downstream of Discharge Point 001. The translators were based on monthly receiving water data collected from the Sacramento River at Caldwell Park upstream of both facilities.

Order R5-2007-0167 required downstream receiving water monitoring for total and dissolved copper and zinc for comparison with the total to dissolved ratios achieved at the Caldwell Park monitoring location. Based on this data, the Discharger submitted an 18 July 2012 translator study, developed in accordance with SIP and U.S. EPA guidance, proposing updated site-specific translators for copper and zinc. The Central Valley Water Board has reviewed the updated study and finds that the proposed translators are appropriate. Therefore, the updated translators have been

used for copper and zinc in this Order. The table below summarizes the previous and updated site-specific translators:

**Table F-9. Site-Specific Translators for Copper and Zinc**

Parameter	Aquatic Life Criteria	Translator	
		2007 Permit	2013 Update
Copper	Acute	0.811	0.94
	Chronic	0.771	0.78
Zinc	Acute	0.766	0.71
	Chronic	0.705	0.62

The default U.S. EPA conversion factors contained in Appendix 3 of the SIP were used to convert the applicable dissolved criteria to total recoverable criteria for the remaining metals.

- e. **Hardness-Dependent CTR Metals Criteria.** The *California Toxics Rule* and the *National Toxics Rule* contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness. The lower the hardness the lower the water quality criteria. The metals with hardness-dependent criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc.

This Order has established the criteria for hardness-dependent metals based on the reasonable worst-case ambient hardness as required by the SIP<sup>1</sup>, the CTR<sup>2</sup> and State Water Board Order No. WQO 2008-0008 (City of Davis). The SIP and the CTR require the use of “receiving water” or “actual ambient” hardness, respectively, to determine effluent limitations for these metals. (SIP, § 1.2; 40 CFR § 131.38(c)(4)) The CTR does not define whether the term “ambient,” as applied in the regulations, necessarily requires the consideration of upstream as opposed to downstream hardness conditions. Therefore, where reliable, representative data are available, the hardness value for calculating criteria can be the downstream receiving water hardness, after mixing with the effluent (Order WQO 2008-0008, p. 11). The Central Valley Water Board thus has considerable discretion in determining ambient hardness (*Id.*, p.10).

As discussed below, scientific literature provides a reliable method for calculating protective hardness-dependent CTR criteria, considering all discharge conditions. This methodology produces hardness-dependent CTR criteria based on the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness that ensure these metals do not cause receiving water toxicity under any downstream receiving water condition. Under this methodology, the Central Valley Water Board considers all hardness conditions that could occur in the ambient downstream receiving water after the effluent has mixed with the water body<sup>3</sup>. This ensures that effluent limitations are fully protective of aquatic life in all areas of the receiving water affected by the discharge under all flow conditions, at the fully mixed location, and throughout the water body including at the point of discharge into the water body.

<sup>1</sup> The SIP does not address how to determine the hardness for application to the equations for the protection of aquatic life when using hardness-dependent metals criteria. It simply states, in Section 1.2, that the criteria shall be properly adjusted for hardness using the hardness of the receiving water.

<sup>2</sup> The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>), or less, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water must be used. It further requires that the hardness values used must be consistent with the design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones.

<sup>3</sup> All effluent discharges will change the ambient downstream metals concentration and hardness. It is not possible to change the metals concentration without also changing the hardness.

- i. **Conducting the Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA).** The SIP in Section 1.3 states, “*The RWQCB shall...determine whether a discharge may: (1) cause, (2) have a reasonable potential to cause, or (3) contribute to an excursion above any applicable priority pollutant criterion or objective.*” Section 1.3 provides a step-by-step procedure for conducting the RPA. The procedure requires the comparison of the maximum effluent concentration (MEC) and maximum ambient background concentration to the applicable criterion that has been properly adjusted for hardness. Unless otherwise noted, for the hardness-dependent CTR metals criteria the following procedures were followed for properly adjusting the criterion for hardness when conducting the RPA.
  - (a) The SIP requires WQBELs if the MEC is equal to or exceeds the applicable criterion, adjusted for hardness. For comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, the “fully mixed” reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness was used to adjust the criterion. In this evaluation the portion of the receiving water affected by the discharge is analyzed. For hardness-dependent criteria, the hardness of the effluent has an impact on the determination of the applicable criterion in areas of the receiving water affected by the discharge. Therefore, for comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness was used to adjust the criterion. For this situation it is necessary to consider the hardness of the effluent in determining the applicable hardness to adjust the criterion. The procedures for determining the applicable criterion after proper adjustment using the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness is outlined in subsection ii, below.
  - (b) The SIP requires WQBELs if the receiving water is impaired upstream (outside the influence) of the discharge, i.e., if the maximum ambient background concentration of a pollutant exceeds the applicable criterion, adjusted for hardness<sup>1</sup>. For comparing the maximum ambient background concentration to the applicable criterion, the reasonable worst-case upstream ambient hardness was used to adjust the criteria. This is appropriate, because this area is outside the influence of the discharge. Since the discharge does not impact the upstream hardness, the effect of the effluent hardness was not included in this evaluation.
- ii. **Calculating Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations.** The remaining discussion in this section relates to the development of WQBELs when it has been determined that the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR hardness-dependent metals criteria in the receiving water.

A 2006 Study<sup>2</sup> developed procedures for calculating the effluent concentration allowance (ECA)<sup>3</sup> for CTR hardness-dependent metals. The 2006 Study demonstrated that it is necessary to evaluate all discharge conditions (e.g., high and low flow conditions) and the hardness and metals concentrations of the effluent and receiving water when determining the

---

<sup>1</sup> The pollutant must also be detected in the effluent.

<sup>2</sup> Emerick, R.W.; Borroum, Y.; & Pedri, J.E., 2006. California and National Toxics Rule Implementation and Development of Protective Hardness Based Metal Effluent Limitations. WEFTEC, Chicago, Ill.

<sup>3</sup> The ECA is defined in Appendix 1 of the SIP (page Appendix 1-2). The ECA is used to calculate WQBELs in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP.

appropriate ECA for these hardness-dependent metals. This method is superior to relying on downstream receiving water samples alone because it captures all possible mixed conditions in the receiving water. Both receiving water and effluent hardness vary based on flow and other factors, but the variability of receiving water and effluent hardness is sometimes independent. Using a calculated hardness value ensures that the Central Valley Water Board considers all possible mixed downstream values that may result from these two independent variables. Relying on receiving water sampling alone is less likely to capture all possible mixed downstream conditions.

The equation describing the total recoverable regulatory criterion, as established in the CTR<sup>1</sup>, is as follows:

$$\text{CTR Criterion} = \text{WER} \times (e^{m[\ln(H)]+b}) \text{ (Equation 1)}$$

Where:

H = hardness (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)<sup>2</sup>

WER = water-effect ratio

m, b = metal- and criterion-specific constants

In accordance with the CTR, the default value for the WER is 1. A WER study must be conducted to use a value other than 1. The constants “m” and “b” are specific to both the metal under consideration, and the type of total recoverable criterion (i.e., acute or chronic). The metal-specific values for these constants are provided in the CTR at paragraph (b)(2), Table 1.

The equation for the ECA is defined in Section 1.4, Step 2, of the SIP and is as follows:

$$\text{ECA} = C \quad (\text{when } C \leq B)^3 \text{ (Equation 2)}$$

Where:

C = the priority pollutant criterion/objective, adjusted for hardness (see Equation 1, above)

B = the ambient background concentration

The 2006 Study demonstrated that the relationship between hardness and the calculated criteria is the same for some metals, so the same procedure for calculating the ECA may be used for these metals. The same procedure can be used for cadmium (chronic), chromium III, copper, nickel, and zinc. These metals are hereinafter referred to as “Concave Down Metals”. “Concave Down” refers to the shape of the curve represented by the relationship between hardness and the CTR criteria in Equation 1. Another similar procedure can be used for determining the ECA for cadmium (acute), lead, and silver (acute), which are referred to hereafter as “Concave Up Metals”.

***ECA for Cadmium (Chronic), Chromium III, Copper, Nickel, and Zinc*** – For Concave Down Metals (i.e., cadmium (chronic), chromium III, copper, nickel, and zinc) the 2006 Study demonstrates that when the effluent is in compliance with the CTR criteria and the upstream receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria, any mixture of the effluent and receiving water will always be

---

<sup>1</sup> 40 CFR § 131.38(b)(2).

<sup>2</sup> For this discussion, all hardness values are in mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>.

<sup>3</sup> The 2006 Study assumes the ambient background metals concentration is equal to the CTR criterion (i.e.,  $C \leq B$ )

in compliance with the CTR criteria<sup>1</sup>. The 2006 Study proves that regardless of whether the effluent hardness is lower or greater than the upstream hardness, the reasonable worst-case flow condition is the effluent dominated condition (i.e., no receiving water flow)<sup>2</sup>. Consequently, for Concave Down Metals where no dilution credit has been granted, the CTR criteria have been calculated using the downstream ambient hardness under this condition. For Concave Down Metals where a dilution credit has been granted (e.g., copper and zinc), the criteria have been calculated using the hardness at the edge of the allocated mixing zone.

**Concave Down Metals – No Dilution Credit.** The effluent hardness ranged from 76 mg/L to 116 mg/L, based on 36 samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013. The upstream receiving water hardness varied from 40 mg/L to 116 mg/L, based on 36 samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013. Under the effluent dominated condition, the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness is 76 mg/L. As demonstrated in the example shown in Table F-10, below, using this hardness to calculate the ECA for all Concave Down Metals (where no dilution credits are allowed) will result in WQBELs that are protective under all flow conditions, from the effluent dominated condition to high flow condition. This example for nickel assumes the following conservative conditions for the upstream receiving water:

Upstream receiving water always at the lowest observed upstream receiving water hardness (i.e., 40 mg/L)

Upstream receiving water nickel concentration always at the CTR criteria (i.e., no assimilative capacity).

Using these reasonable worst-case receiving water conditions, a simple mass balance (as shown in Equation 3, below) accounts for all possible mixtures of effluent and receiving water under all flow conditions.

$$C_{MIX} = C_{RW} \times (1-EF) + C_{Eff} \times (EF) \quad (\text{Equation 3})$$

Where:

$C_{MIX}$  = Mixed concentration (e.g., metals or hardness)

$C_{RW}$  = Upstream receiving water concentration

$C_{Eff}$  = Effluent concentration

EF = Effluent Fraction

In this example, for nickel, for any receiving water flow condition (high flow to low flow), the fully-mixed downstream ambient nickel concentration is in compliance with the CTR criteria<sup>3</sup>. [When no dilution credit(s) are allowed for a parameter.]

---

<sup>1</sup> 2006 Study, p. 5700

<sup>2</sup> There are two typographical errors in the 2006 Study in the discussion of Concave Down Metals when the effluent hardness is less than the receiving water hardness. The effluent and receiving water hardness were transposed in the discussion, but the correct hardness values were used in the calculations. The typographical errors were confirmed by the author of the 2006 Study, by email dated 1 April 2011, from Dr. Robert Emerick to Mr. James Marshall, Central Valley Water Board.

<sup>3</sup> This method considers the actual lowest observed upstream hardness and actual lowest observed effluent hardness to determine the reasonable worst-case ambient downstream hardness under all possible receiving water flow conditions. Table F-10 demonstrates that the receiving water is always in compliance with the CTR criteria at the fully-mixed location in the receiving water. It also demonstrates that the receiving water is in

**Table F-10. Nickel ECA Evaluation**

Lowest Observed Effluent Hardness		76 mg/L (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )			
Lowest Observed Upstream Receiving Water Hardness		40 mg/L (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )			
Highest Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Nickel Concentration		24 µg/L <sup>1</sup>			
Nickel ECA <sub>chronic</sub> <sup>2</sup>		41 µg/L			
Effluent Fraction <sup>6</sup>		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
		Hardness <sup>3</sup> (mg/L)	CTR Criteria <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Nickel <sup>5</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria
High Flow ↓ Low Flow	1%	40	24	24	Yes
	5%	42	25	25	Yes
	15%	45	27	27	Yes
	25%	49	29	28	Yes
	50%	58	33	33	Yes
	75%	67	37	37	Yes
	100%	76	41	41	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Highest assumed upstream receiving water nickel concentration calculated using Equation 1 for chronic criterion at a hardness of 40 mg/L.

<sup>2</sup> ECA calculated using Equation 1 for chronic criterion at a hardness of 76 mg/L.

<sup>3</sup> Fully mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness at the applicable effluent fraction using Equation 3.

<sup>4</sup> Fully mixed downstream ambient criteria are the chronic criteria calculated using Equation 1 at the mixed hardness.

<sup>5</sup> Fully mixed downstream ambient nickel concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent nickel concentrations at the applicable effluent fraction using Equation 3.

<sup>6</sup> The effluent fraction ranges from 1% at the high receiving water flow condition, to 100% at the lowest receiving water flow condition (i.e., effluent dominated).

**Concave Down Metals - Dilution Credit Allowed.** In this site-specific case and as discussed in Section IV.C.2 c, above, dilution credits for copper and zinc have been allowed in the calculation of WQBELs for these hardness-dependent criteria parameters. As discussed in Section IV.C.2.c, above, the allowed copper dilution credit for chronic aquatic life criteria is 10:1, which represents an effluent fraction of 9.1%. This value defines the points in the receiving water (i.e., edge of mixing zone) that must be in compliance with aquatic life criteria. When the effluent and receiving water are at their respective minimum observed hardness values (i.e., 76 mg/L and 40 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>, respectively), and the effluent fraction is 9.1%, the mixed hardness is 43.3 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>). Therefore, a hardness of 43.3 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) has been used in this Order for calculating hardness-dependent copper chronic criteria. Using the ambient hardness to calculate the hardness-dependent metals criteria is consistent with the CTR and the SIP.

Table F-11, below, is an example demonstrating that protective effluent limitations result when using this approach for determining the appropriate hardness. In this example the mixed receiving water copper concentration does not exceed the mixed CTR criteria for copper. A similar approach has also been used for calculating hardness-dependent zinc criteria.

---

compliance with the CTR criteria for all mixtures from the point of discharge to the fully-mixed location. Therefore, a mixing zone is not used for compliance.



**Table F-11. Copper ECA Evaluation – Dilution Credit Allowed**

Hardness				46 mg/L (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	
CTR Copper Chronic Criterion, Total Recoverable				5.6 µg/L	
Chronic Aquatic Life Dilution Credit				10	
Maximum Background Copper Concentration				3 µg/L	
Chronic ECA for Copper <sup>1</sup>				31.7	
Effluent Fraction <sup>6</sup>	Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration				
	Hardness <sup>2</sup> (mg/L)	CTR Criteria <sup>3</sup> (µg/L)	Copper <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria	
	1%	40	5.3	3.3	Yes
	3%	41	5.4	3.9	Yes
	5%	42	5.5	4.4	Yes
	7%	43	5.5	5.0	Yes
	9.1%	43.3	5.6	5.6	Yes

<sup>1</sup> ECA calculated per Section 1.4 of the SIP.

<sup>2</sup> Mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness using the lowest observed hardness values (i.e., 40 mg/L and 76 mg/L for the receiving water and effluent, respectively).

<sup>3</sup> Mixed downstream ambient criteria is the CTR chronic criterion calculated using the mixed hardness.

<sup>4</sup> Mixed downstream ambient copper concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent copper concentration using the maximum background copper concentration (i.e., 3.0 µg/L) and the effluent copper concentration at the ECA.

**ECA for Cadmium (Acute), Lead, and Silver (Acute)** – For Concave Up Metals (i.e., cadmium (acute), lead, and silver (acute)), the relationship between hardness and the metals criteria is different than for Concave Down Metals. The 2006 Study demonstrates that for Concave Up Metals, the effluent and upstream receiving water can be in compliance with the CTR criteria, but the resulting mixture may contain metals concentrations that exceed the CTR criteria and could cause toxicity. For these metals, the 2006 Study provides a mathematical approach to calculate the ECA that is protective of aquatic life, in all areas of the receiving water affected by the discharge, under all discharge and receiving water flow conditions (see Equation 4, below).

The ECA, as calculated using Equation 4, is based on the reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water hardness, the lowest observed effluent hardness, and assuming no receiving water assimilative capacity for metals (i.e., ambient background metals concentrations are at their respective CTR criterion). Equation 4 is not used in place of the CTR equation (Equation 1). Rather, Equation 4, which is derived using the CTR equation, is used as a direct approach for calculating the ECA. This replaces an iterative approach for calculating the ECA. The CTR equation has been used to evaluate the receiving water downstream of the discharge at all discharge and flow conditions to ensure the ECA is protective (e.g., see Table F-12).

$$ECA = \left( \frac{m(H_e - H_{rw}) \left( e^{m(\ln(H_{rw})) + b} \right)}{H_{rw}} \right) + e^{m(\ln(H_{rw})) + b} \quad (\text{Equation 4})$$

Where:

$m, b =$  criterion specific constants (from CTR)  
 $H_e =$  lowest observed effluent hardness  
 $H_{rw} =$  reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water hardness

An example similar to the Concave Down Metals is shown for lead, a Concave Up Metal, in Table F-13, below. As previously mentioned, the lowest effluent hardness is 76 mg/L, while the upstream receiving water hardness ranged from 40 mg/L to 116 mg/L. In this case, the reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water hardness to use in Equation 4 to calculate the ECA is 40 mg/L.

Using the procedures discussed above to calculate the ECA for all Concave Up Metals will result in WQBELs that are protective under all potential effluent/receiving water flow conditions (high flow to low flow) and under all known hardness conditions, as demonstrated in Table F-12, for lead.

**Table F-12. Lead ECA Evaluation**

Lowest Observed Effluent Hardness					76 mg/L
Reasonable Worst-case Upstream Receiving Water Hardness					40 mg/L
Reasonable Worst-case Upstream Receiving Water Lead Concentration					0.99 µg/L <sup>1</sup>
Lead ECA <sub>chronic</sub> <sup>2</sup>					2.1 µg/L
Effluent Fraction <sup>6</sup>		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
		Hardness <sup>3</sup> (mg/L) (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	CTR Criteria <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Lead <sup>5</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria
<div>High Flow</div> <div>↓</div> <div>Low Flow</div>	1%	1.0	1.0	1.0	Yes
	5%	1.0	1.0	1.0	Yes
	15%	1.2	1.2	1.2	Yes
	25%	1.3	1.3	1.3	Yes
	50%	1.6	1.6	1.6	Yes
	75%	1.9	1.8	1.9	Yes
	100%	2.2	2.1	2.2	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water lead concentration calculated using Equation 1 for chronic criterion at a hardness of 40 mg/L.

<sup>2</sup> ECA calculated using Equation 4 for chronic criteria.

<sup>3</sup> Fully mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness at the applicable effluent fraction.

<sup>4</sup> Fully mixed downstream ambient criteria are the chronic criteria calculated using Equation 1 at the mixed hardness.

<sup>5</sup> Fully mixed downstream ambient lead concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent lead concentrations at the applicable effluent fraction.

<sup>6</sup> The effluent fraction ranges from 1% at the high receiving water flow condition, to 100% at the lowest receiving water flow condition (i.e., effluent dominated).

Based on the procedures discussed above, Table F-13 lists all the CTR hardness-dependent metals and the associated ECA used in this Order.

**Table F-13. Summary of ECA Evaluations for CTR Hardness-dependent Metals**

<b>CTR Metals</b>	<b>ECA (µg/L, total recoverable)<sup>1</sup></b>	
	<b>acute</b>	<b>chronic</b>
Copper <sup>2</sup>	42.7	31.7
Chromium III	1,400	170
Cadmium	3.2	2.0
Lead	55	2.1

CTR Metals	ECA (µg/L, total recoverable) <sup>1</sup>	
	acute	chronic
Nickel	372	41
Silver	2.1	--
Zinc <sup>2</sup>	179	151

<sup>1</sup> Metal criteria rounded to two significant figures in accordance with the CTR.

<sup>2</sup> ECAs for copper and zinc calculated using site-specific translators and dilution credits.

### 3. Determining the Need for WQBELs

- a. **Constituents with No Reasonable Potential.** WQBELs are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential (i.e., constituents were not detected in the effluent or receiving water); however, monitoring for those pollutants is established in this Order as required by the SIP. If the results of effluent monitoring demonstrate reasonable potential, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.

Most constituents with no reasonable potential are not discussed in this Order. However, the following constituents were found to have no reasonable potential after assessment of the data:

#### i. Beta-BHC

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan requires that no individual pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses; discharges shall not result in pesticide concentrations in bottom sediments or aquatic life that adversely affect beneficial uses; persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides shall not be present in the water column at detectable concentrations; and pesticide concentrations shall not exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies. Beta-BHC is a persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides. The Basin Plan pesticide non-detect objective has been interpreted to be equal to the Minimum Levels (MLs) specified in Appendix 4 of the SIP. The SIP specifies an ML of 0.005 µg/L for beta-BHC. In addition, the CTR contains a numeric criterion for beta-BHC of 0.014 µg/L for the protection of human health for freshwaters from which both water and organisms are consumed. Order R5-2007-0167 established effluent limitations for beta-BHC based on the Basin Plan narrative objective.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Beta-BHC was not detected in the effluent or upstream receiving water based on 13 samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013 (minimum MDL 0.002 µg/L, minimum RL 0.005 µg/L). Therefore, beta-BHC in the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above Basin Plan narrative objective or the CTR criterion, and the effluent limitations for beta-BHC have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

#### ii. Salinity

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates state MCLs, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for certain specified water bodies for

electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, and chloride. The U.S. EPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Chloride recommends acute and chronic criteria for the protection of aquatic life. There are no U.S. EPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and sulfate. Additionally, there are no U.S. EPA numeric water quality criteria for the protection of agricultural, livestock, and industrial uses. Numeric values for the protection of these uses are typically based on site specific conditions and evaluations to determine the appropriate constituent threshold necessary to interpret the narrative chemical constituent Basin Plan objective. The Central Valley Water Board must determine the applicable numeric limit to implement the narrative objective for the protection of agricultural supply. The Central Valley Water Board is currently implementing the CV-SALTS initiative to develop a Basin Plan Amendment that will establish a salt and nitrate Management Plan for the Central Valley. Through this effort the Basin Plan will be amended to define how the narrative water quality objective is to be interpreted for the protection of agricultural use. All studies conducted through this Order to establish an agricultural limit to implement the narrative objective will be reviewed by and consistent with the efforts currently underway by CV-SALTS.

**Table F-14. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives**

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Objective <sup>1</sup>	Secondary MCL <sup>2</sup>	U.S. EPA NAWQC	Effluent	
				Average <sup>3</sup>	Maximum
EC (µmhos/cm)	Varies	900, 1600, 2200	N/A	397	474
TDS (mg/L)	Varies	500, 1000, 1500	N/A	270	303
Sulfate (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	N/A	32.4	32.4
Chloride (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	860 1-hr 230 4-day	41	41

<sup>1</sup> Narrative chemical constituent objective of the Basin Plan. Procedures for establishing the applicable numeric limitation to implement the narrative objective can be found in the Policy for Application of Water Quality, Chapter IV, Section 8 of the Basin Plan. However, the Basin Plan does not require improvement over naturally occurring background concentrations. In cases where the natural background concentration of a particular constituent exceeds an applicable water quality objective, the natural background concentration will be considered to comply with the objective.

<sup>2</sup> The Secondary MCLs are stated as a recommended level, upper level, and a short-term maximum level.

<sup>3</sup> Maximum calendar annual average.

- (1) **Chloride.** The Secondary MCL for chloride is 250 mg/L, as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.
- (2) **Electrical Conductivity.** The Secondary MCL for electrical conductivity is 900 µmhos/cm as a recommended level, 1600 µmhos/cm as an upper level, and 2200 µmhos/cm as a short-term maximum.
- (3) **Sulfate.** The Secondary MCL for sulfate is 250 mg/L as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.
- (4) **Total Dissolved Solids.** The Secondary MCL for total dissolved solids is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

(b) **RPA Results**

- (1) **Chloride.** Chloride concentrations in the effluent ranged from 32.3 mg/L to 41 mg/L, with a maximum annual average of 41 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in the Sacramento River ranged from 1.85 mg/L to 2.4 mg/L, with a maximum annual average of 2.4 mg/L.
- (2) **Electrical Conductivity.** A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports shows a maximum annual average effluent EC of 397  $\mu$ mhos/cm, with a range from 314  $\mu$ mhos/cm to 474  $\mu$ mhos/cm. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in the Sacramento River ranged from 105  $\mu$ mhos/cm to 395  $\mu$ mhos/cm, with a maximum annual average of 140  $\mu$ mhos/cm.
- (3) **Sulfate.** Sulfate concentrations in the effluent ranged from 19.2 mg/L to 32.4 mg/L, with a maximum annual average of 32.4 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in the Sacramento River ranged from 3.11 mg/L to 6.31 mg/L, with maximum annual average of 6.31 mg/L.
- (4) **Total Dissolved Solids.** The maximum annual average total dissolved solids effluent concentration was 270 mg/L with concentrations ranging from 184 mg/L to 303 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. The background receiving water TDS ranged from 45 mg/L to 88 mg/L, with a maximum annual average of 77 mg/L.

Based on the relatively low reported salinity, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of water quality objectives for salinity. However, since the Discharger discharges to the Sacramento River and eventually the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, of additional concern is the salt contribution to Delta waters. Allowing the Discharger to increase its current salt loading may be contrary to the Region-wide effort to address salinity in the Central Valley. Therefore, in order to ensure that the Discharger will continue to control the discharge of salinity, this Order includes a requirement to continue to implement a salinity evaluation and minimization plan. Also water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the relative contribution of salinity from the source water to the effluent.

- b. **Constituents with No Data or Insufficient Data.** Reasonable potential cannot be determined for the following constituents because effluent data are limited or ambient background concentrations are not available. The Discharger is required to continue to monitor for these constituents in the effluent using analytical methods that provide the best feasible detection limits. When additional data become available, further analysis will be conducted to determine whether to add numeric effluent limitations or to continue monitoring.
  - i. **Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate**
    - (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 1.8  $\mu$ g/L for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed.

- (b) **RPA Results.** Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is a common contaminant of sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment, and sources of detected bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate may be from plastics used for sampling or analytical equipment. “Clean techniques” are used to ensure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detections for monitoring bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate.

As shown in the table below, bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected but not quantified (i.e., j-flagged) in one of three effluent samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013. Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on three samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013.

**Table F-15. Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate Data Summary**

Sample Date	Results (µg/L)	SIP ML (µg/L)	RL (µg/L)
<b><i>Effluent</i></b>			
7 July 2011	DNQ 2	5	5
5 April 2012	ND	5	5
11 July 2013	ND	5	2
<b><i>Upstream Receiving Water</i></b>			
7 July 2011	ND	5	5
5 April 2012	ND	5	5
11 July 2013	ND	5	2

ND – Not detected

DNQ– Detected, but not quantified

SIP Section 2.4.2 states that the ML is the lowest quantifiable concentration in a sample based on the proper application of all method-based analytical procedures and the absence of any matrix interferences.

- (1) Required MLs are listed in Appendix 4 of the SIP. Where more than one ML is listed in Appendix 4, the Discharger may select any one of the cited analytical methods for compliance determination. The selected ML used for compliance determination is referred to as the Reporting Level (RL).
- (2) An RL can be lower than the ML in Appendix 4 only when the Discharger agrees to use an RL that is lower than the ML listed in Appendix 4. The Central Valley Water Board and the Discharger have no agreement to use an RL lower than the listed MLs.
- (3) SIP Section 1.2 requires that the Regional Water Board use all available, valid, relevant, representative data and information, as determined by the Regional Water Board, to implement the SIP. SIP Section 1.2 further states that the Regional Water Board has the discretion to consider if any data are inappropriate or insufficient for use in implementing the SIP.
- (4) Data reported below the ML indicates the data may not be valid due to possible matrix interferences during the analytical procedure.
- (5) Further, SIP Section 2.4.5 (Compliance Determination) supports the insufficiency of data reported below the ML or RL. In part it states, “Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent

*limitation, for reporting and administrative enforcement purposes, if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the RL." Thus, if submitted data is below the RL, that data cannot be used to determine compliance with effluent limitations.*

- (6) Data reported below the ML is not considered valid data for use in determining reasonable potential. Therefore, in accordance with Section 1.2 of the SIP, the Central Valley Water Board has determined that data reported below the ML is inappropriate and insufficient to be used to determine reasonable potential.
- (7) In implementing its discretion, the Central Valley Water Board is not finding that reasonable potential does not exist; rather the Central Valley Water Board cannot make such a determination given the invalid data. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board will require additional monitoring for such constituents until such time a determination can be made in accordance with the SIP policy.

SIP Appendix 4 cites two MLs for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate. The lowest applicable ML cited for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is 5 µg/L. Except for the July 2013 sample, the Discharger used an analytical method that was as sensitive as the ML required by the SIP. For the July 2013 sample, the Discharger used an analytical method that was more sensitive than the SIP. The effluent results were all estimated values (i.e., DNQ) or non-detect. Furthermore, the Discharger has indicated that the samples were collected using a sampler with plastic tubing. Therefore, the submitted effluent data is inappropriate and insufficient to determine reasonable potential under the SIP.

Section 1.3, Step 8 of the SIP allows the Central Valley Water Board to require additional monitoring for a pollutant in place of an effluent limitation if data are unavailable or insufficient. Instead of limitations, additional monitoring has been established for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate. Should monitoring results indicate that the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding appropriate effluent limitations.

## ii. Cadmium

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR and the Basin Plan include hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for cadmium. These criteria for cadmium are presented in dissolved concentrations, as 1-hour acute criteria and 4-day chronic criteria. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. Default U.S. EPA translators were used for the receiving water and effluent.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet includes procedures for conducting the RPA for hardness-dependent CTR metals, such as cadmium. The RPA was conducted using the upstream receiving water hardness to calculate the criteria for comparison to the maximum ambient background concentration, and likewise using the reasonable worst-case

downstream hardness to compare the MEC. The table below shows the specific criteria used for the RPA.

**Table F-16. Cadmium RPA Summary**

	<b>Basin Plan Objective (Total Recoverable)</b>	<b>CTR Chronic Criterion (Total Recoverable)</b>	<b>Maximum Concentration (Total Recoverable)</b>	<b>Reasonable Potential? (Y/N)</b>
Receiving Water	0.22 <sup>1</sup>	1.2 µg/L <sup>1</sup>	2.04 µg/L	Inconclusive <sup>2</sup>
Effluent	0.49 <sup>3</sup>	2.0 µg/L <sup>3</sup>	DNQ 0.08 µg/L	No <sup>4</sup>

DNQ – Detected, but not quantified

<sup>1</sup> Based on lowest observed upstream hardness of 40 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>).

<sup>2</sup> Per Section 1.3, step 6 of the SIP.

<sup>3</sup> Based on reasonable worst-case downstream hardness of 76 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>).

<sup>4</sup> Per Section 1.3, step 4 of the SIP.

Total recoverable cadmium was detected but not quantified in the effluent in three out of 12 effluent samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013 (see table below). Total recoverable cadmium was detected in the upstream receiving water in one out of 12 upstream receiving water samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013 (see table below). Since the effluent data was detected but not quantified, the data is insufficient per Section 1.2 of the SIP.

**Table F-17. Cadmium Data Summary**

<b>Sample Date</b>	<b>Effluent (µg/L)</b>	<b>Upstream Receiving Water (µg/L)</b>	<b>MDL (µg/L)</b>	<b>RL (µg/L)</b>	<b>SIP ML (µg/L)</b>
5 January 2011	ND	ND	0.05	0.25	0.25
7 April 2011	ND	ND	0.05	0.25	0.25
7 July 2011	ND	ND	0.05	0.25	0.25
6 October 2011	ND	ND	0.05	0.25	0.25
5 January 2012	DNQ 0.08	ND	0.05	0.25	0.25
5 April 2012	ND	ND	0.05	0.25	0.25
5 July 2012	DNQ 0.08	2.04	0.05	0.25	0.25
4 October 2012	ND	ND	0.05	0.25	0.25
3 January 2013	ND	ND	0.05	0.25	0.25
4 April 2013	DNQ 0.05	ND	0.05	0.25	0.25
11 July 2013	ND	ND	0.05	0.2	0.25
3 October 2013	ND	DNQ 0.05	0.05	0.2	0.25

ND – Not detected

DNQ – Detected, but not quantified

SIP Section 2.4.2 states that the ML is the lowest quantifiable concentration in a sample based on the proper application of all method-based analytical procedures and the absence of any matrix interferences.

- (1) Required MLs are listed in Appendix 4 of the SIP. Where more than one ML is listed in Appendix 4, the Discharger may select any one of the cited analytical methods for compliance determination. The selected ML used for compliance determination is referred to as the RL.



- (2) An RL can be lower than the ML in Appendix 4 only when the Discharger agrees to use an RL that is lower than the ML listed in Appendix 4. The Central Valley Water Board and the Discharger have no agreement to use an RL lower than the listed MLs.
- (3) SIP Section 1.2 requires that the Regional Water Board use all available, valid, relevant, representative data and information, as determined by the Regional Water Board, to implement the SIP. SIP Section 1.2 further states that the Regional Water Board has the discretion to consider if any data are inappropriate or insufficient for use in implementing the SIP.
- (4) Data reported below the ML indicates the data may not be valid due to possible matrix interferences during the analytical procedure.
- (5) Further, SIP Section 2.4.5 (Compliance Determination) supports the insufficiency of data reported below the ML or RL. In part it states, *"Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation, for reporting and administrative enforcement purposes, if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the RL."* Thus, if submitted data is below the RL, that data cannot be used to determine compliance with effluent limitations.
- (6) Data reported below the ML is not considered valid data for use in determining reasonable potential. Therefore, in accordance with Section 1.2 of the SIP, the Central Valley Water Board has determined that data reported below the ML is inappropriate and insufficient to be used to determine reasonable potential.
- (7) In implementing its discretion, the Central Valley Water Board is not finding that reasonable potential does not exist; rather the Central Valley Water Board cannot make such a determination given the invalid data. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board will require additional monitoring for such constituents until such time a determination can be made in accordance with the SIP policy.

SIP Appendix 4 cites several MLs for cadmium. The applicable ML cited for cadmium is 0.25 µg/L. The Discharger used an analytical method that was as sensitive as the ML required by the SIP. The effluent results were all non-detects or estimated values (i.e., detected but not quantified). Therefore, the submitted effluent cadmium data is inappropriate and insufficient to determine reasonable potential under the SIP.

Section 1.3, Step 6 of the SIP states that if the receiving water concentration exceeds the criteria and the pollutant is detected in the effluent, an effluent limitation is required. However; as discussed in detail above, insufficient effluent data is available at this time to justify establishing an effluent limitation for cadmium.

Section 1.3, Step 8 of the SIP allows the Central Valley Water Board to require additional monitoring for a pollutant in place of an effluent limitation if data are unavailable or insufficient. Instead of limitations, additional monitoring has been established for cadmium. Should monitoring results indicate that the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or

contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding appropriate effluent limitations.

- c. **Constituents with Reasonable Potential.** The Central Valley Water Board finds that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality standard for ammonia, BOD<sub>5</sub>, chlorine residual, chlorodibromomethane, copper, diazinon and chlorpyrifos, dichlorobromomethane, pH, total coliform organisms, TSS, and zinc. WQBELs for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the RPA is provided in Attachment G, and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.

i. **Ammonia**

- (a) **WQO.** In August 2013, U.S. EPA updated its National Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for total ammonia<sup>1</sup>. The 2013 NAWQC for ammonia recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration or CMC) and chronic (30-day average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards that vary based on pH and temperature. U.S. EPA also recommends that no 4-day average concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. The 2013 NAWQC for ammonia takes into account data for several sensitive freshwater mussel species and non-pulmonate snails that had not previously been tested.

U.S. EPA found that as pH and temperature increased, both the acute and chronic toxicity of ammonia increased for invertebrates. However, U.S. EPA found that only pH significantly influenced acute and chronic ammonia toxicity for fish. Therefore, the 2013 acute NAWQC for ammonia is primarily based on the ammonia effects on species in the genus *Oncorhynchus* (salmonids) at lower temperatures and invertebrates at higher temperatures. However, due to the significant sensitivity unionid mussels have to the chronic toxicity effects of ammonia, the 2013 chronic NAWQC for ammonia is determined primarily by the effects of mussels.

The 2013 ammonia NAWQC document states that “*unionid mussel species are not prevalent in some waters, such as the arid west.*” The 2013 ammonia NAWQC also states that, “*In the case of ammonia, where a state demonstrates that mussels are not present on a site-specific basis, the recalculation procedure may be used to remove the mussel species from the national criteria dataset to better represent the species present at the site.*” The 2013 ammonia NAWQC document, therefore, includes a recalculation procedure for acute and chronic criteria for waters where mussels are not present. The 2013 ammonia NAWQC also provides criteria for waters where *Oncorhynchus* species are not present and where protection of early life stages of fish genera is unnecessary.

A report prepared by The Nature Conservancy, *Sensitive Freshwater Mussel Surveys in the Pacific Southwest Region: Assessment of Conservation Status* (published August 2010), demonstrates the results of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia – Freshwater*, published August 2013 [EPA 822-R-13-001]

a strategic mussel study and survey conducted during 2008-2009. The report contains survey information for the Sacramento River approximately 10 miles upstream of the Facility, which indicates that mussels were not historically present. There is limited information whether mussels are present at the discharge location and the report did not provide any additional surveys for mussels within 100 river miles downstream of the discharge. On 3 April 2014, the Central Valley Water Board issued a CWC Section 13267 Order to the Discharger which requires additional information from the Discharger to evaluate whether more restrictive ammonia criteria for other species (i.e., unionid mussels) is applicable for the Sacramento River near the Facility. However, since mussels were not found at the Sacramento River survey station 10 miles upstream of the discharge, site-specific water quality criteria for ammonia were calculated, at this time, assuming no mussels are present. The Sacramento River has a beneficial use of cold freshwater habitat (COLD) and the salmonids and early fish life stages in the Sacramento River is well-documented, therefore, the recommended ammonia criteria for waters where salmonids and early life stages are present were used.

The maximum permitted effluent limit pH is 8.5 and the maximum observed effluent temperature was 77.4°F. In order to protect against the worst- case short-term exposure of an organism, a pH value of 8.5 and a maximum observed effluent temperature of 77.4°F was used to derive the acute criterion. The resulting acute criterion is 2.14 mg/L.

Receiving water monitoring for pH and temperature was conducted once per month, resulting in 36 sets of paired pH and temperature data. The maximum observed receiving water temperature and pH were 13°C and 8.31 standard units, respectively. The maximum ammonia effluent concentration was 1.16 mg/L. In accordance with U.S. EPA's 2013 Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia – Freshwater , the 30-day CCC was determined by calculating the CCC for each paired pH and temperature set and taking the 95th percentile CCC (with criterion ranked from high (less stringent) to low (more stringent)). The resulting 30-day CCC is 2.73 mg/L. The 4-day average concentration is derived in accordance with the U.S. EPA criterion as 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. Based on the 30-day CCC of 2.73 mg/L (as N), the 4-day average concentration that should not be exceeded is 6.84 mg/L (as N).

- (b) **RPA Results.** The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia in concentrations that, without treatment, would be harmful to fish and would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if discharged to the receiving water. Reasonable potential therefore exists and effluent limitations are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Ammonia is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-

specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).*" U.S. EPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*" With regard to POTWs, U.S. EPA recommends that, "*POTWs should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.*" (TSD, p. 50)

Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrite and nitrite to nitrate. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. The Discharger currently uses nitrification to remove ammonia from the waste stream. Inadequate or incomplete nitrification may result in the discharge of ammonia to the receiving stream. Ammonia is known to cause toxicity to aquatic organisms in surface waters. Although the Discharger nitrifies the discharge, inadequate or incomplete nitrification creates the potential for ammonia to be discharged and provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for ammonia and WQBELs are required.

- (c) **WQBELs.** The Central Valley Water Board calculates WQBELs in accordance with SIP procedures for non-CTR constituents, and ammonia is a non-CTR constituent. The SIP procedure assumes a 4-day averaging period for calculating the long-term average discharge condition (LTA). However, U.S. EPA recommends modifying the procedure for calculating permit limits for ammonia using a 30-day averaging period for the calculation of the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC. Therefore, while the LTAs corresponding to the acute and 4-day chronic criteria were calculated according to SIP procedures, the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC was calculated assuming a 30-day averaging period. The lowest LTA representing the acute, 4-day CCC, and 30-day CCC is then selected for deriving the average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and the maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL). The remainder of the WQBEL calculation for ammonia was performed according to the SIP procedures.

This Order contains a final AMEL and MDEL for ammonia of 9 mg/L and 22 mg/L, respectively, based on U.S. EPA's NAWQC, which implements the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective for protection of aquatic life.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the maximum effluent ammonia concentration of 1.16 mg/L (as N) is less than the applicable WQBELs. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board concludes that immediate compliance with these effluent limits is feasible.

ii. **Chlorine Residual**

- (a) **WQO.** U.S. EPA developed NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life for chlorine residual. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for chlorine residual are 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively. These criteria are protective of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

- (b) **RPA Results.** The concentrations of chlorine used to disinfect wastewater are high enough to harm aquatic life and violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if discharged to the receiving water. Reasonable potential therefore does exist and effluent limits are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Chlorine is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used its judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters)." U.S. EPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data." With regard to POTWs, U.S. EPA recommends that, "POTWs should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems." (TSD, p. 50)

The Discharger uses chlorine for disinfection, which is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. Although the Discharger uses a sulfur dioxide process to dechlorinate the effluent prior to discharge to the Sacramento River, the existing chlorine use and the potential for chlorine to be discharged provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC.

- (c) **WQBELs.** The U.S. EPA *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control* [EPA/505/2-90-001] contains statistical methods for converting chronic (4-day) and acute (1-hour) aquatic life criteria to average monthly and maximum daily effluent limitations based on the variability of the existing data and the expected frequency of monitoring. However, because chlorine is an acutely toxic constituent that can and will be monitored continuously, an average 1-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. This Order contains a 4-day average effluent limitation and 1-hour average effluent limitation for chlorine residual of 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively, based on U.S. EPA's NAWQC, which implements the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective for protection of aquatic life.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows the Facility can meet these WQBELs.

iii. **Chlorodibromomethane**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.41 µg/L for chlorodibromomethane for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for chlorodibromomethane was 5.1 µg/L based on 39 samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013 (minimum MDL 0.06 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L). Chlorodibromomethane was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on three samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013 (minimum MDL 0.06 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L). Therefore, chlorodibromomethane in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (c) **WQBELs.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for chlorodibromomethane, therefore, a human health dilution credit of 38.8:1 was allowed in the development of the WQBELs for chlorodibromomethane. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for chlorodibromomethane of 14 µg/L and 28 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health..
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** . Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 1.4 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iv. **Copper**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR and Basin Plan include hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for copper. These criteria for

copper are presented in dissolved concentrations, as 1-hour acute criteria and 4-day chronic criteria. As described in section IV.C.2.d of this Fact Sheet, site-specific translators were used for converting the dissolved criteria to total recoverable.

- (b) **RPA Results.** Section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet includes procedures for conducting the RPA for hardness-dependent CTR metals, such as copper. The RPA was conducted using the upstream receiving water hardness to calculate the criteria for comparison to the maximum ambient background concentration, and likewise using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness to compare the MEC. The table below shows the specific criteria used for the RPA.

**Table F-18. Copper RPA Summary**

	<b>Basin Plan Objective (Total Recoverable)</b>	<b>CTR Chronic Criterion (Total Recoverable)</b>	<b>Maximum Concentration (Total Recoverable)</b>	<b>Reasonable Potential? (Y/N)</b>
Receiving Water	6.0 <sup>1</sup>	5.3 µg/L <sup>1</sup>	3 µg/L	No <sup>2</sup>
Effluent	11 <sup>3</sup>	9.1 µg/L <sup>3</sup>	9.9 µg/L	Yes <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Based on lowest observed upstream hardness of 40 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and a site-specific acute translator of 0.94.

<sup>2</sup> Per Section 1.3, step 6 of the SIP.

<sup>3</sup> Based on reasonable worst-case downstream hardness of 76 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and a site-specific chronic translator of 0.78.

<sup>4</sup> Per Section 1.3, step 4 of the SIP.

Based on the available data, copper in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life

- (c) **WQBELs.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for copper, therefore, an acute criterion dilution credit of 10.7:1 and a chronic dilution credit of 10:1 was allowed in the development of the WQBELs for copper. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for copper of 29 µg/L and 43 µg/L, respectively, based on the Basin Plan Objective and CTR criterion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 9.9 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

v. **Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos**

- (a) **WQO.** The Central Valley Water Board recently completed a TMDL for diazinon and chlorpyrifos in the Sacramento and Feather Rivers and amended the Basin Plan to include diazinon and chlorpyrifos waste load allocations and water quality objectives. The Basin Plan Amendment for the Control of Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos was adopted by the Central Valley Water Board on 21 October 2005 and was approved by the State Water Board on 2 May 2006. The Basin Plan amendment was approved by the Office of Administrative Law on 30 June 2006 and is now State law.

The amendment was approved by U.S. EPA and went into effect on 20 December 2006.

The amendment modifies the Basin Plan Chapter III (Water Quality Objectives) to establish site specific numeric objectives for chlorpyrifos and diazinon in the Sacramento and Feather Rivers. The amendment also *"...identifies the requirements to meet the additive formula already in Basin Plan Chapter IV (implementation), for the additive toxicity of diazinon and chlorpyrifos."*

The amendment provides that: *"The Waste Load Allocations (WLA) for all NPDES-permitted dischargers... shall not exceed the sum (S) of one (1) as defined below."*

$$S = \frac{C_D}{WQO_D} + \frac{C_C}{WQO_C} \leq 1.0$$

where:

$C_D$  = diazinon concentration in  $\mu\text{g/L}$  of the point source discharge...

$C_C$  = chlorpyrifos concentration in  $\mu\text{g/L}$  of the point source discharge...

$WQO_D$  = acute or chronic diazinon water quality objective in  $\mu\text{g/L}$ .

$WQO_C$  = acute or chronic chlorpyrifos water quality objective in  $\mu\text{g/L}$ .

*Available samples collected within the applicable averaging period for the water quality objective will be used to determine compliance with the allocations and loading capacity. For purposes of calculating the sum (S) above, analytical results that are reported as 'non detectable' concentrations are considered to be zero."*

- (b) **RPA Results.** Effluent and receiving water monitoring data for diazinon and chlorpyrifos is not available. However, due to the TMDL for diazinon and chlorpyrifos in the Sacramento River, WQBELs for these constituents are required. The TMDL waste load allocation applies to all NPDES dischargers to the Sacramento and Feather Rivers and will serve as the basis for WQBELs.
- (c) **WQBELs.** WQBELs for diazinon and chlorpyrifos are required based on the TMDL for diazinon and chlorpyrifos for the Sacramento River. Therefore, this Order includes effluent limits calculated based on the waste load allocations contained in the TMDL, as follows:

(1) Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

$$S_{AMEL} = \frac{C_{D\text{ AVG}}}{0.079} + \frac{C_{C\text{ AVG}}}{0.012} \leq 1.0$$

$C_{D\text{-avg}}$  = average monthly diazinon effluent concentration in  $\mu\text{g/L}$

$C_{C\text{-avg}}$  = average monthly chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in  $\mu\text{g/L}$

(2) Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

$$S_{MDEL} = \frac{C_{D\text{ MAX}}}{0.16} + \frac{C_{C\text{ MAX}}}{0.025} \leq 1.0$$

$C_{D\text{-max}}$  = maximum daily diazinon effluent concentration in  $\mu\text{g/L}$

$C_{C\text{-max}}$  = maximum daily chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in  $\mu\text{g/L}$



- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** No data is available from the Facility to indicate the presence or absence of chlorpyrifos and diazinon. It is unlikely that chlorpyrifos and diazinon will be detected at concentrations exceeding applicable water quality objectives as sales of all non-agricultural uses of diazinon were banned on 31 December 2004 and sales of the majority of non-agricultural uses of chlorpyrifos were banned in December 2001. The Discharger does not add chlorpyrifos or diazinon to the treatment process.

vi. **Dichlorobromomethane**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.56 µg/L for dichlorobromomethane for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for dichlorobromomethane was 10.7 µg/L based on 39 samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013 (minimum MDL 0.06 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L). Dichlorobromomethane was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on three samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013 (minimum MDL 0.06 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L). Therefore, dichlorobromomethane in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (c) **WQBELs.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane, therefore, a human health dilution credit of 54.8:1 was allowed in the development of the WQBELs for dichlorobromomethane. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for dichlorobromomethane of 28 µg/L and 54 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 10.7 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

vii. **Nitrate and Nitrite**

- (a) **WQO.** DPH has adopted Primary MCLs for the protection of human health for nitrite and nitrate that are equal to 1 mg/L and 10 mg/L (measured as nitrogen), respectively. DPH has also adopted a Primary MCL of 10 mg/L for the sum of nitrate and nitrite, measured as nitrogen. U.S. EPA has developed a Primary MCL and an MCL goal of 1 mg/L for nitrite (as nitrogen). For nitrate, U.S. EPA has developed Drinking Water Standards (10 mg/L as Primary MCL) and NAWQC for protection of human health (10 mg/L for non-cancer health effects).
- (b) **RPA Results.** The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia in concentrations that, if untreated, will be harmful to fish and will violate the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. This Order, therefore, requires removal of ammonia (i.e., nitrification). Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrate and nitrite, and will result in effluent nitrate

concentrations above the Primary MCL for nitrate plus nitrite. Nitrate concentrations in a drinking water supply above the Primary MCL threatens the health of human fetuses and newborn babies by reducing the oxygen-carrying capacity of the blood (methemoglobinemia). Reasonable potential for nitrate and nitrite therefore exists and WQBELs are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, *“Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.”* For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Nitrate and nitrite are not priority pollutants. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, *“State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).”* U.S. EPA’s TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, *“When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.”* With regard to POTWS, U.S. EPA recommends that, *“POTWs should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.”* (TSD, p. 50)

The concentration of nitrogen in raw domestic wastewater is sufficiently high that the resultant treated wastewater has a reasonable potential to exceed or threaten to exceed the Primary MCL for nitrate plus nitrite unless the wastewater is treated for nitrogen removal, and therefore an effluent limit for nitrate plus nitrite is required. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. Inadequate or incomplete denitrification may result in the discharge of nitrate and/or nitrite to the receiving stream. Discharges of nitrate plus nitrite in concentrations that exceed the Primary MCL would violate the Basin Plan narrative chemical constituents objective. Inadequate or incomplete denitrification creates the potential for nitrate and nitrite to be discharged and provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to

cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Primary MCL. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for nitrate plus nitrite and WQBELs are required.

- (c) **WQBELs.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for nitrate, therefore, a dilution credit of 3:1 was allowed in the development of the WQBELs for nitrate. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) for nitrate plus nitrite of 40 mg/L, based on the Primary MCL. This effluent limitation is included in this Order to assure the treatment process adequately nitrifies and denitrifies the waste stream to protect the beneficial use of municipal and domestic supply.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 16.2 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

viii. **Pathogens**

- (a) **WQO.** In a letter to the Central Valley Water Board dated 8 April 1999, DPH indicated it would consider wastewater discharged to water bodies with identified beneficial uses of irrigation or contact recreation and where the wastewater receives dilution of more than 20:1 to be adequately disinfected if the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median and if the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 240 MPN/100 mL more than once in any 30 day period.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Municipal and domestic supply, agricultural irrigation, and body contact water recreation are beneficial uses of the Sacramento River. The wastewater receives dilution of more than 20:1 in the receiving water at all times. Therefore, the DPH requirements are applicable to the discharge.
- (c) **WQBELs.** Pursuant to guidance from DPH, this Order includes effluent limitations for total coliform organisms of 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median and 240 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period. These coliform limits are imposed to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water, including public health through contact recreation and drinking water pathways.

Final WQBELs for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are based on the technical capability of the advanced secondary process, which is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. BOD<sub>5</sub> is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The advanced secondary treatment standards for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the advanced secondary treatment process. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS loading rates and the corresponding removal rate of the system. The application of advanced secondary treatment processes results in the ability to achieve lower levels for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed. Therefore, this Order requires AMELs for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS of 10 mg/L, which is technically based on the capability of an advanced secondary system. In addition to the average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations, a daily maximum

effluent limitation for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS is included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows the Facility can meet these WQBELs.

ix. **pH**

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for surface waters (except for Goose Lake) that the “...pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.”
- (b) **RPA Results.** Raw domestic wastewater inherently has variable pH. Additionally, some wastewater treatment processes can increase or decrease wastewater pH which if not properly controlled, would violate the Basin Plan’s numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, reasonable potential exists for pH and WQBELs are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, “*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*” For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. pH is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, “*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).*” U.S. EPA’s TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, “*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*” (TSD, p. 50)

The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Based on 1,096 samples collected between January 2011 and December 2013, the maximum effluent pH reported was 7.49 and the minimum was 6.29. The minimum effluent pH was below the numeric receiving water quality objective effluent seven times. Although the Discharger has proper pH

controls in place, the pH for the Facility's influent varies due to the nature of municipal sewage, which provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan's numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, WQBELs for pH are required in this Order.

- (c) **WQBELs.** Discharger monitoring reports from January 2011 through December 2013 show a pH range in the receiving water downstream of the discharge of 7.01 to 8.31 (based on 36 data points). Based on the Discharger's data, the discharge has not caused receiving water to exceed the numeric water quality objective for pH. Effluent limitations for pH of 6.0 as an instantaneous minimum and 8.5 as an instantaneous maximum are included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan objectives for pH.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The effluent pH range was within the instantaneous minimum and instantaneous maximum effluent limitations established in this Order based on 1,096 samples. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board concludes that the Discharger can consistently comply with these effluent limitations.

x. **Zinc**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR and Basin Plan include hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for zinc. These criteria for zinc are presented in dissolved concentrations, as 1-hour acute criteria and 4-day chronic criteria. As described in section IV.C.2.d of this Fact Sheet, site-specific translators were used for converting the dissolved criteria to total recoverable.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet includes procedures for conducting the RPA for hardness-dependent CTR metals, such as zinc. The RPA was conducted using the upstream receiving water hardness to calculate the criteria for comparison to the maximum ambient background concentration, and likewise using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness to compare the MEC. The table below shows the specific criteria used for the RPA.

**Table F-19. Zinc RPA Summary**

	<b>Basin Plan Objective (Total Recoverable)</b>	<b>CTR Chronic Criterion (Total Recoverable)</b>	<b>Maximum Concentration (Total Recoverable)</b>	<b>Reasonable Potential? (Y/N)</b>
Receiving Water	23 <sup>1</sup>	88 µg/L <sup>1</sup>	9.5 µg/L	No <sup>2</sup>
Effluent	38 <sup>3</sup>	151 µg/L <sup>3</sup>	101 µg/L	Yes <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Based on lowest observed upstream hardness of 40 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and a site-specific acute translator of 0.71.

<sup>2</sup> Per Section 1.3, step 6 of the SIP.

<sup>3</sup> Based on reasonable worst-case downstream hardness of 76 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and a site-specific chronic translator of 0.62.

<sup>4</sup> Per Section 1.3, step 4 of the SIP.

Based on the available data, zinc in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life

- (c) **WQBELs.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for zinc, therefore, an acute criterion dilution credit of 10.7:1 was allowed in the development of the WQBELs for zinc. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for zinc of 125 µg/L and 179 µg/L, respectively, based on the Basin Plan Objective and CTR criterion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 9.5 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

#### 4. WQBEL Calculations

- a. This Order includes WQBELs for ammonia, BOD<sub>5</sub>, chlorine residual, chlorodibromomethane, copper, diazinon and chlorpyrifos, dichlorobromomethane, pH, total coliform organisms, TSS, and zinc. The general methodology for calculating WQBELs based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.5.b through e, below. See Attachment H for the WQBEL calculations.
- b. **Effluent Concentration Allowance.** For each water quality criterion/objective, the ECA is calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation from Section 1.4 of the SIP:

$$\begin{array}{ll} ECA = C + D(C - B) & \text{where } C > B, \text{ and} \\ ECA = C & \text{where } C \leq B \end{array}$$

where:

ECA	= effluent concentration allowance
D	= dilution credit
C	= the priority pollutant criterion/objective
B	= the ambient background concentration.

According to the SIP, the ambient background concentration (B) in the equation above shall be the observed maximum with the exception that an ECA calculated from a priority pollutant criterion/objective that is intended to protect human health from carcinogenic effects shall use the arithmetic mean concentration of the ambient background samples. For ECAs based on MCLs, which implement the Basin Plan's chemical constituents objective and are applied as annual averages, an arithmetic mean is also used for B due to the long-term basis of the criteria.

- c. **Basin Plan Objectives and MCLs.** For WQBELs based on site-specific numeric Basin Plan objectives or MCLs, the effluent limitations are applied directly as the ECA as either an MDEL, AMEL, or average annual effluent limitations, depending on the averaging period of the objective.
- d. **Aquatic Toxicity Criteria.** WQBELs based on acute and chronic aquatic toxicity criteria are calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are converted to equivalent long-term averages (i.e.  $LTA_{acute}$  and  $LTA_{chronic}$ ) using

statistical multipliers and the lowest LTA is used to calculate the AMEL and MDEL using additional statistical multipliers.

- e. **Human Health Criteria.** WQBELs based on human health criteria, are also calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are set equal to the AMEL and a statistical multiplier was used to calculate the MDEL.

$$AMEL = mult_{AMEL} \left[ \min \left( \overbrace{M_A ECA_{acute}}^{LTA_{acute}}, M_C ECA_{chronic} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL = mult_{MDEL} \left[ \min \left( M_A ECA_{acute}, \underbrace{M_C ECA_{chronic}}_{LTA_{chronic}} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL_{HH} = \left( \frac{mult_{MDEL}}{mult_{AMEL}} \right) AMEL_{HH}$$

where:

$mult_{AMEL}$  = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL

$mult_{MDEL}$  = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL

$M_A$  = statistical multiplier converting acute ECA to  $LTA_{acute}$

$M_C$  = statistical multiplier converting chronic ECA to  $LTA_{chronic}$

### Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations Discharge Point 001

Table F-20. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	167	250	500	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	8.5
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	167	250	500	--	--
Priority Pollutants						
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	14	--	28	--	--
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	29	--	43	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	28	--	54	--	--
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	125	--	179	--	--
Non-Conventional Pollutants						
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	9.0	--	22	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	150	--	370	--	--
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	--	0.011 <sup>2</sup>	0.019 <sup>3</sup>	--	--
Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos	µg/L	<sup>4</sup>	--	<sup>4</sup>	--	--
Nitrate Plus Nitrite	mg/L	40	--	--	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	23 <sup>6</sup>	240 <sup>7</sup>	--	500

<sup>1</sup> Based on an average dry weather flow of 2.0 MGD.

<sup>2</sup> Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.

<sup>3</sup> Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.

<sup>4</sup> Average Monthly Effluent Limitation

$$S_{avg} = \frac{C_{D,avg}}{0.079} + \frac{C_{C,avg}}{0.012} \leq 1.0$$

$C_{D,avg}$  = average monthly diazinon effluent concentration in µg/L

$C_{C,avg}$  = average monthly chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in µg/L

<sup>5</sup> Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation

$$S_{max} = \frac{C_{D,max}}{0.16} + \frac{C_{C,max}}{0.025} \leq 1.0$$

$C_{D,avg}$  = maximum daily diazinon effluent concentration in µg/L

$C_{C,avg}$  = maximum daily chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in µg/L

<sup>6</sup> Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.

<sup>7</sup> Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.

## 5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct whole effluent toxicity testing for acute and chronic toxicity, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E section V.). This Order also contains effluent limitations for acute toxicity and requires the Discharger to implement best management practices to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity.

- a. **Acute Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*" (Basin Plan at page III-8.00) The Basin Plan also states that, "...effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate..."

For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Acute toxicity is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Therefore, due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA. U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).*" Although the discharge has been consistently in compliance with the acute effluent limitations, the Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater containing ammonia and other acutely toxic pollutants. Acute toxicity effluent limits are required to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.



U.S. EPA Region 9 provided guidance for the development of acute toxicity effluent limitations in the absence of numeric water quality objectives for toxicity in its document titled "Guidance for NPDES Permit Issuance", dated February 1994. In section B.2. "Toxicity Requirements" (pgs. 14-15) it states that, "*In the absence of specific numeric water quality objectives for acute and chronic toxicity, the narrative criterion 'no toxics in toxic amounts' applies. Achievement of the narrative criterion, as applied herein, means that ambient waters shall not demonstrate for acute toxicity: 1) less than 90% survival, 50% of the time, based on the monthly median, or 2) less than 70% survival, 10% of the time, based on any monthly median. For chronic toxicity, ambient waters shall not demonstrate a test result of greater than 1 TUc.*" Accordingly, effluent limitations for acute toxicity have been included in this Order as follows:

**Acute Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:

Minimum for any one bioassay ----- 70%  
Median for any three consecutive bioassays ----- 90%

- b. **Chronic Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*" (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.) The effluent exhibited chronic toxicity to *Ceriodaphnia dubia* growth and reproduction (>1 TUc) in May 2012, but follow-up testing did not result in toxicity in 100% effluent. Chronic toxicity was not observed for *Pimephales promelas* or *Selenastrum capricornutum* in the May 2012 sample, nor in any of the remaining annual three-species toxicity tests. As shown in the table below, based on chronic WET testing performed by the Discharger, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

**Table F-21. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results**

Date	Fathead Minnow <i>Pimephales promelas</i>		Water Flea <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>		Green Algae <i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
	Survival (TUc)	Growth (TUc)	Survival (TUc)	Reproduction (TUc)	Growth (TUc)
13 December 2011	1	1	1	1	1
15 May 2012	1	1	>1	>1	1
12 June 2012	--	--	1	1	--
10 September 2013	1	1	1	1	1

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires annual chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, the Special Provision in section VI.C.2.a of the Order includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation if toxicity is demonstrated. Dilution has been granted for the chronic condition in this Order. Therefore, this Order includes a monitoring trigger of 9 TUc.

Numeric chronic WET effluent limitations have not been included in this Order. The SIP contains implementation gaps regarding the appropriate form and implementation of chronic toxicity limits. This has resulted in the petitioning of a

NPDES permit in the Los Angeles Region<sup>1</sup> that contained numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations. To address the petition, the State Water Board adopted WQO 2003-012 directing its staff to revise the toxicity control provisions in the SIP. The State Water Board states the following in WQO 2003-012, *"In reviewing this petition and receiving comments from numerous interested persons on the propriety of including numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity in NPDES permits for publicly-owned treatment works that discharge to inland waters, we have determined that this issue should be considered in a regulatory setting, in order to allow for full public discussion and deliberation. We intend to modify the SIP to specifically address the issue. We anticipate that review will occur within the next year. We therefore decline to make a determination here regarding the propriety of the final numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity contained in these permits."* The process to revise the SIP is currently underway. Proposed changes include clarifying the appropriate form of effluent toxicity limits in NPDES permits and general expansion and standardization of toxicity control implementation related to the NPDES permitting process. Since the toxicity control provisions in the SIP are under revision it is infeasible to develop numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity. Therefore, this Order requires that the Discharger meet best management practices for compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, as allowed under 40 CFR 122.44(k).

To ensure compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, the Discharger is required to conduct chronic WET testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, section V.). Furthermore, the Special Provision contained at VI.C.2.a. of this Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify and implement corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge demonstrates toxicity exceeding the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with an approved TRE workplan. The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to perform accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, as well as, the threshold to initiate a TRE if effluent toxicity has been demonstrated.

#### **D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations**

##### **1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations**

40 CFR 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 CFR 122.45(f)(2) allows pollutants that are limited in terms of mass to additionally be limited in terms of other units of measurement. This Order includes effluent limitations expressed in terms of mass and concentration. In addition, pursuant to the exceptions to mass limitations provided in 40 CFR 122.45(f)(1), some effluent limitations are not expressed in terms of mass, such as pH and temperature, and when the applicable standards are expressed in terms of concentration (e.g., CTR criteria and MCLs) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Matter of the Review of Own Motion of Waste Discharge Requirements Order Nos. R4-2002-0121 [NPDES No. CA0054011] and R4-2002-0123 [NPDES NO. CA0055119] and Time Schedule Order Nos. R4-2002-0122 and R4-2002-0124 for Los Coyotes and Long Beach Wastewater Reclamation Plants Issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region SWRCB/OCC FILES A-1496 AND 1496(a)

Mass-based effluent limitations have been established in this Order for ammonia, BOD<sub>5</sub>, and TSS because they are oxygen demanding substances. Except for the pollutants listed above, mass-based effluent limitations are not included in this Order for pollutant parameters for which effluent limitations are based on water quality objectives and criteria that are concentration-based.

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the design flow (average dry weather flow) permitted in section IV.A.1.f of this Order.

## 2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations

40 CFR 122.45 (d) requires average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations for POTWs unless impracticable. However, for toxic pollutants and pollutant parameters in water quality permitting, U.S. EPA recommends the use of a maximum daily effluent limitation in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for two reasons. *“First, the basis for the 7-day average for POTWs derives from the secondary treatment requirements. This basis is not related to the need for assuring achievement of water quality standards. Second, a 7-day average, which could comprise up to seven or more daily samples, could average out peak toxic concentrations and therefore the discharge’s potential for causing acute toxic effects would be missed.”* (TSD, pg. 96) This Order uses maximum daily effluent limitations in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc as recommended by the TSD for the achievement of water quality standards and for the protection of the beneficial uses of the receiving stream. Furthermore, for BOD<sub>5</sub>, chlorine residual, pH, total coliform organisms, and TSS, weekly average effluent limitations have been replaced or supplemented with effluent limitations utilizing shorter averaging periods. The rationale for using shorter averaging periods for these constituents is discussed in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

## 3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements

The Clean Water Act specifies that a revised permit may not include effluent limitations that are less stringent than the previous permit unless a less stringent limitation is justified based on exceptions to the anti-backsliding provisions contained in Clean Water Act sections 402(o) or 303(d)(4), or, where applicable, 40 CFR 122.44(l).

The effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in Order R5-2007-0167, with the exception of effluent limitations for ammonia and beta-BHC. The effluent limitations for these pollutants are less stringent than those in Order R5-2007-0167. This relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.

- a. **CWA section 402(o)(1) and 303(d)(4).** CWA section 402(o)(1) prohibits the establishment of less stringent water quality-based effluent limits “except in compliance with Section 303(d)(4).” CWA section 303(d)(4) has two parts: paragraph (A) which applies to nonattainment waters and paragraph (B) which applies to attainment waters.
  - i. For waters where standards are not attained, CWA section 304(d)(4)(A) specifies that any effluent limit based on a TMDL or other WLA may be revised only if the cumulative effect of all such revised effluent limits based on such TMDLs or WLAs will assure the attainment of such water quality standards.
  - ii. For attainment waters, CWA section 303(d)(4)(B) specifies that a limitation based on a water quality standard may be relaxed where the action is consistent with the antidegradation policy.

The Sacramento River is considered an attainment water for ammonia and beta-BHC because the receiving water is not listed as impaired on the 303(d) list for these constituents<sup>1</sup>. As discussed in section IV.D.4, below, removal or relaxation of the effluent limits complies with federal and state antidegradation requirements. Thus, removal or relaxation of the effluent limitations for ammonia and beta-BHC from Order R5-2007-0167 meets the exception in CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

- b. **CWA section 402(o)(2).** CWA section 402(o)(2) provides several exceptions to the anti-backsliding regulations. CWA 402(o)(2)(B)(i) allows a renewed, reissued, or modified permit to contain a less stringent effluent limitation for a pollutant if information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance.

As described further in section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2007-0167 was issued indicates that beta-BHC does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives in the receiving water. Additionally, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2007-0167 was issued indicates that less stringent effluent limitations for ammonia based on available dilution credits satisfy requirements in CWA section 402(o)(2). The updated information that supports the relaxation of effluent limitations for these constituents includes the following:

- i. **Ammonia.** Order R5-2007-0167 included effluent limitations for ammonia based on the 1999 NAWQC acute criterion calculated based on the permitted pH of 9.0. At the time Order R5-2007-0167 was adopted, no upstream receiving water ammonia data was available for the ECA calculation. This Order includes effluent limitations for ammonia calculated based on the updated April 2013 NAWQC acute criterion calculated using the revised effluent pH maximum limitation of 8.5, ambient background data collected between January 2011 and December 2013, and an updated coefficient of variation based on effluent data collected between January 2011 and December 2013.
- ii. **Beta-BHC.** Effluent and receiving water monitoring data collected between January 2011 and December 2013 for beta-BHC indicates that the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR human health criteria or the Basin Plan narrative objective for persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides.

Thus, removal or relaxation of the effluent limitations for ammonia and beta-BHC from Order R5-2007-0167 is in accordance with CWA section 402(o)(2)(B)(i), which allows for the removal of effluent limitations based on information that was not available at the time of permit issuance.

#### 4. Antidegradation Policies

This Order does not allow for an increase in flow or mass of pollutants to the receiving water. Therefore, a complete antidegradation analysis is not necessary. The Order requires compliance with applicable federal technology-based standards and with WQBELs where the discharge could have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute

---

<sup>1</sup> “The exceptions in Section 303(d)(4) address both waters in attainment with water quality standards and those not in attainment, i.e. waters on the section 303(d) impaired waters list.” State Water Board Order WQ 2008-0006, Berry Petroleum Company, Poso Creek/McVan Facility.

to an exceedance of water quality standards. The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

This Order removes existing effluent limitations for constituents in which updated monitoring data demonstrates that the effluent does not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the applicable water quality criteria or objectives in the receiving water (i.e., beta-BHC). This Order relaxes existing effluent limitations for ammonia based on applicable criteria evaluated with updated information. The removal of the WQBELs for beta-BHC and the relaxation of WQBELs for ammonia will not result in an increase in pollutant concentration or loading, a decrease in the level of treatment or control, or a reduction of water quality. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds that the removal and relaxation of the effluent limitations does not result in an allowed increase in pollutants or any additional degradation of the receiving water. Thus, the removal and relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68 16.

#### 5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on flow and percent removal requirements for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. Restrictions on these pollutants are discussed in section IV.B.2 of this Fact Sheet. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards.

WQBELs have been derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant water quality-based effluent limitations were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations for priority pollutants are based on the CTR implemented by the SIP, which was approved by U.S. EPA on May 18, 2000. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by U.S. EPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to U.S. EPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by U.S. EPA before that date, are nonetheless "applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA" pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

### Summary of Final Effluent Limitations Discharge Point 001

Table F-22. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis <sup>1</sup>
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
Flow	MGD	--	--	2.0 <sup>2</sup>	--	--	DC

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis <sup>1</sup>
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
Conventional Pollutants							
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	AS
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	167	250	500	--	--	
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--	CFR
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	8.5	BP
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	AS
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	167	250	500	--	--	
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--	CFR
Priority Pollutants							
Chlorodibromo-methane	µg/L	14	--	28	--	--	CTR
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	29	--	43	--	--	CTR
Dichlorobromo-methane	µg/L	28	--	54	--	--	CTR
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	125	--	179	--	--	CTR
Non-Conventional Pollutants							
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	9.0	--	22	--	--	NAWQC
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	150	--	370	--	--	
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	--	0.011 <sup>4</sup>	0.019 <sup>5</sup>	--	--	NAWQC
Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos	µg/L	<sup>6</sup>	--	<sup>7</sup>	--	--	TMDL
Nitrate Plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	40	--	--	--	--	MCL
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	23 <sup>8</sup>	240 <sup>9</sup>	--	500	Title 22
Acute Toxicity	% Survival	--	--	70 <sup>10</sup> /90 <sup>11</sup>	--	--	BP

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis <sup>1</sup>
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	

- <sup>1</sup> DC – Based on the design capacity of the Facility.  
AS – Based on advanced secondary treatment capability. These effluent limitations reflect the capability of a properly operated advanced secondary treatment plant.  
CFR – Based on secondary treatment standards contained in 40 CFR Part 133.  
BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.  
CTR – Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the SIP.  
NAWQC – Based on U.S. EPA's National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.  
TMDL – Based on the TMDL for the Sacramento and Feather Rivers.  
MCL – Based on the Primary Maximum Contaminant Level.  
Title 22 – Based on CA Department of Public Health Reclamation Criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22).
- <sup>2</sup> The average dry weather flow shall not exceed 2.0 MGD.
- <sup>3</sup> Based on an average dry weather flow of 2.0 MGD.
- <sup>4</sup> Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.
- <sup>5</sup> Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.
- <sup>6</sup> Average Monthly Effluent Limitation  

$$S_{avg} = \frac{C_{D-avg}}{0.079} + \frac{C_{C-avg}}{0.012} \leq 1.0$$

$$C_{D-avg} = \text{average monthly diazinon effluent concentration in } \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$C_{C-avg} = \text{average monthly chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in } \mu\text{g/L}$$
- <sup>7</sup> Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation  

$$S_{max} = \frac{C_{D-max}}{0.16} + \frac{C_{C-max}}{0.025} \leq 1.0$$

$$C_{D-max} = \text{maximum daily diazinon effluent concentration in } \mu\text{g/L}$$

$$C_{C-max} = \text{maximum daily chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in } \mu\text{g/L}$$
- <sup>8</sup> Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.
- <sup>9</sup> Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.
- <sup>10</sup> 70% minimum of any one bioassay.
- <sup>11</sup> 90% median for any three consecutive bioassays.

**E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable**

**F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable**

**G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable**

**V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

**A. Surface Water**

1. CWA section 303(a-c), requires states to adopt water quality standards, including criteria where they are necessary to protect beneficial uses. The Central Valley Water Board adopted water quality criteria as water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan states that “[t]he numerical and narrative water quality objectives define the least stringent standards that the Regional Water Board will apply to regional waters in order to protect the beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives for various beneficial uses and water bodies. This Order contains receiving surface water limitations based on the Basin Plan numerical and narrative water quality objectives for bacteria, biostimulatory substances, color, chemical constituents, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pH, pesticides,

radioactivity, salinity, suspended sediment, settleable substances, suspended material, tastes and odors, temperature, toxicity, and turbidity.

- a. **pH.** Order R5-2007-0167 established a receiving water limitation for pH specifying that discharges from the Facility shall not cause the ambient pH to change by more than 0.5 units based on the water quality objective for pH in the Basin Plan. The Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2007-0136 on 25 October 2007, amending the Basin Plan to delete the portion of the pH water quality objective that limits the change in pH to 0.5 units and the allowance of averaging periods for pH. The Basin Plan amendment has been approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. EPA. Consistent with the revised water quality objective in the Basin Plan, this Order does not require a receiving water limitation for pH change.

In Finding No. 14 of Resolution R5-2007-0136 the Central Valley Water Board found that the change in the pH receiving water objective is consistent with the State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, in that the changes to water quality objectives (i) consider maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12).

Ammonia is the only constituent in the discharge regulated by this Order directly related to pH. The fixed ammonia effluent limitations in this Order are based on reasonable worse-case conditions. Although ammonia criteria are based on pH, the fixed ammonia limits are developed to protect under worse-case pH conditions. Therefore the relaxation of the pH receiving water limitation will protect aquatic life and other beneficial uses and will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses nor result in water quality less than described in applicable policies. The relaxation of the receiving water limitation is not expected to cause other impacts on water quality. The Central Valley Water Board finds that the relaxation of the pH receiving water limitation (i) is to the maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12).

The revised receiving water limitation for pH, which is based on the amendment to the Basin Plan's pH water quality objective, reflects current scientifically supported pH requirements for the protection of aquatic life and other beneficial uses. The revised receiving water limitation for pH is more consistent with the current U.S. EPA recommended criteria and is fully protective of aquatic life and the other beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan. Changes in pH when pH is maintained within the range of 6.5 to 8.5 are neither beneficial nor adverse and, therefore, are not considered to be degradation in water quality. Attempting to restrict pH changes to 0.5 pH units would incur substantial costs without demonstrable benefits to beneficial uses. Thus, any changes in pH that would occur under the revised pH limitation would not only be protective of beneficial uses, but also would be consistent with maximum benefit to people of the State. Therefore the proposed amendment will not violate antidegradation policies.

- b. **Turbidity.** Order R5-2007-0167 established a receiving water limitation for turbidity specifying that discharges from the Facility shall not cause the turbidity to increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTU based on the water quality objective for turbidity in the Basin Plan. The Central Valley Water



Board adopted Resolution R5-2007-0136 on 25 October 2007, amending the Basin Plan to limit turbidity to 2 NTU when the natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU. The Basin Plan amendment has been approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. EPA. Consistent with the revised water quality objective in the Basin Plan, this Order limits turbidity to 2 NTU when the natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU.

In Finding No. 14 of Resolution R5-2007-0136 the Central Valley Water Board found that the change in the turbidity receiving water objective is consistent with the State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, in that the changes to water quality objectives (i) consider maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12).

The relaxation of the turbidity receiving water limitation will protect aquatic life and other beneficial uses and will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses nor result in water quality less than described in applicable policies. The relaxation of the receiving water limitation is not expected to cause other impacts on water quality. The Central Valley Water Board finds that the relaxation of the turbidity receiving water limitation (i) is to the maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12).

The revised receiving water limitation for turbidity, which is based on the amendment to the Basin Plan's turbidity water quality objective, reflects current scientifically supported turbidity requirements for the protection of aquatic life and other beneficial uses and, therefore, will be fully protective of aquatic life and the other beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan. Changes in turbidity allowed by the revised receiving water limitation, when ambient turbidity is below 1 NTU, would not adversely affect beneficial uses and would maintain water quality at a level higher than necessary to protect beneficial uses. Restricting low-level turbidity changes further may require costly upgrades, which would not provide any additional protection of beneficial uses. Thus, any changes in turbidity that would occur under the amended turbidity receiving water limitation would not only be protective of beneficial uses, but also would be consistent with maximum benefit to people of the State. Therefore, the relaxed receiving water limitations for turbidity will not violate antidegradation policies.

## **B. Groundwater**

1. The beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater are municipal and domestic supply, industrial service supply, industrial process supply, and agricultural supply.
2. Basin Plan water quality objectives include narrative objectives for chemical constituents, tastes and odors, and toxicity of groundwater. The toxicity objective requires that groundwater be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in humans, plants, animals, or aquatic life. The chemical constituent objective states groundwater shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect any beneficial use. The tastes and odors objective prohibits taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. The Basin Plan also establishes numerical water quality objectives for chemical constituents and radioactivity in groundwaters designated as municipal supply. These include, at a minimum, compliance with MCLs in

Title 22 of the CCR. The bacteria objective prohibits coliform organisms at or above 2.2 MPN/100 mL. The Basin Plan requires the application of the most stringent objective necessary to ensure that waters do not contain chemical constituents, toxic substances, radionuclides, taste- or odor-producing substances, or bacteria in concentrations that adversely affect municipal or domestic supply, agricultural supply, industrial supply or some other beneficial use.

3. Groundwater limitations are required to protect the beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater.

## VI. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

### A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under section 122.42.

Sections 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) of 40 C.F.R. establish conditions that apply to all state-issued NPDES permits. These conditions must be incorporated into the permits either expressly or by reference. If incorporated by reference, a specific citation to the regulations must be included in the Order. Section 123.25(a)(12) of 40 C.F.R. allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the Water Code is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference Water Code section 13387(e).

### B. Special Provisions

#### 1. Reopener Provisions

- a. **Mercury.** This provision allows the Central Valley Water Board to reopen this Order in the event mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted. In addition, this Order may be reopened if the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for dischargers subject to NPDES permits.
- b. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a TRE. This Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if a numeric chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Board, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation based on that objective.
- c. **Water Effects Ratio (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating CTR criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable, except for copper and zinc. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.

- d. **Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos Basin Plan Amendment.** Central Valley Water Board staff is developing a Basin Plan Amendment to provide a chlorpyrifos and diazinon effluent limitation exemption if a discharger can demonstrate that diazinon and chlorpyrifos have not been detected in the effluent. The proposed Basin Plan Amendment may result in needed changes to the diazinon and chlorpyrifos requirements in this Order. Therefore, this Order may be reopened to modify diazinon and chlorpyrifos effluent limitations, as appropriate, in accordance with an amendment to the Basin Plan.

## 2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Requirements.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.) As discussed in section IV.C.5.b of this Fact Sheet, based on whole effluent chronic toxicity testing performed by the Discharger from January 2011 and December 2013, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, this provision includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation if toxicity is demonstrated.

**Monitoring Trigger.** A numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of  $> 9 \text{ TUc}$  (where  $\text{TUc} = 100/\text{NOEC}$ ) is applied in the provision, because this Order allows dilution for the chronic condition.

**Accelerated Monitoring.** The provision requires accelerated WET testing when a regular WET test result exceeds the monitoring trigger. The purpose of accelerated monitoring is to determine, in an expedient manner, whether there is toxicity before requiring the implementation of a TRE. Due to possible seasonality of the toxicity, the accelerated monitoring should be performed in a timely manner, preferably taking no more than 2 to 3 months to complete.


The provision requires accelerated monitoring consisting of four chronic toxicity tests in a six-week period (i.e., one test every two weeks) using the species that exhibited toxicity. Guidance regarding accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation is provided in the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991 (TSD). The TSD at page 118 states, “*EPA recommends if toxicity is repeatedly or periodically present at levels above effluent limits more than 20 percent of the time, a TRE should be required.*” Therefore, four accelerated monitoring tests are required in this provision. If no toxicity is demonstrated in the four accelerated tests, then it demonstrates that toxicity is not present at levels above the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time (only 1 of 5 tests are toxic, including the initial test). However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of effluent toxicity (i.e., toxicity present exceeding the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time), the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.

See the WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart (Figure F-1), below, for further clarification of the accelerated monitoring requirements and for the decision points for determining the need for TRE initiation.

**TRE Guidance.** The Discharger is required to prepare a TRE Workplan in accordance with U.S. EPA guidance. Numerous guidance documents are available, as identified below:

- i. *Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Guidance for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants*, EPA/833-B-99/002, August 1999.
- ii. *Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial Toxicity Reduction Evaluations (TREs)*, EPA/600/2-88/070, April 1989.
- iii. *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures, Second Edition*, EPA 600/6-91/003, February 1991.
- iv. *Toxicity Identification Evaluation: Characterization of Chronically Toxic Effluents, Phase I*, EPA/600/6-91/005F, May 1992.
- v. *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase II Toxicity Identification Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity, Second Edition*, EPA/600/R-92/080, September 1993.
- vi. *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase III Toxicity Confirmation Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity, Second Edition*, EPA 600/R-92/081, September 1993.
- vii. *Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms, Fifth Edition*, EPA-821-R-02-012, October 2002.
- viii. *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA-821-R-02-013, October 2002.
- ix. *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991.

**Figure F-1**  
**WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart**



**3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention**

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** An Evaluation and Minimization Plan for salinity is required to be maintained in this Order to ensure adequate measures are developed and implemented by the Discharger to reduce the discharge of salinity to the Sacramento River.

**4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications**

- a. The operation and maintenance specifications for the emergency storage and sludge drying ponds are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the groundwater. The specifications included in this Order are retained from Order R5-2007-0167.

**5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)**

- a. **Pretreatment Requirements.** 40 CFR 403.8(a) requires POTWs with a total design flow greater than 5 MGD and receiving from Industrial Users pollutants which pass through or interfere with the operation of the POTW or are otherwise subject to pretreatment standards establish a POTW pretreatment program. The Executive Officer may require that a POTW with a design flow of 5 MGD or less develop a POTW pretreatment program if the nature or volume of the industrial influent, treatment process upsets, violations of POTW effluent limitations, contamination of municipal sludge, or other circumstances warrant in order to prevent interference with the POTW or pass through.

The average dry weather design flow for the Facility is less than 5 MGD and the Facility does not receive discharges from Categorical Industrial Users (CIUs) or Significant Industrial Users (SIUs). Under these conditions, the Discharger is not required to develop a pretreatment program pursuant to USEPA regulations set forth in 40 CFR 403.

- b. The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on 2 May 2006. The Monitoring and Reporting Requirements for the General Order were amended by Water Quality Order WQ 2008-0002-EXEC on 20 February 2008. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with greater than one mile of pipes or sewer lines to enroll for coverage under the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans (SSMPs) and report all sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs), among other requirements and prohibitions.

Furthermore, the General Order contains requirements for operation and maintenance of collection systems and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows. The Discharger must comply with both the General Order and this Order. The Discharger and public agencies that are discharging wastewater into the facility were required to obtain enrollment for regulation under the General Order by 1 December 2006.

- c. **Anaerobically Digestible Material.** Managers of POTW's increasingly are considering the addition of organic material such as food waste, fats, oils and grease (FOG) into their anaerobic digesters for co-digestion. Benefits of accepting these materials include increasing the volume of methane and other biogases available for energy production and ensuring such materials are disposed of at the POTW instead of discharged into the collection system potentially causing sanitary sewer overflows. The State Water Board has been working with the California

Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), and the California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA) to delineate jurisdictional authority for the receipt of hauled-in anaerobically digestible material (ADM<sup>1</sup>) at POTW's for co-digestion.

CalRecycle is proposing an exclusion from Process Facility/Transfer Station permits for direct injection of ADM to POTW anaerobic digesters for co-digestion that are regulated under waste discharge requirements or NPDES permits. The proposed CalRecycle exclusion is restricted to ADM that has been prescreened, slurried, and processed/conveyed in a closed system to be co-digested with regular POTW sludge. The CalRecycle exclusion assumes that a POTW has developed Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's) for the proper handling, processing, tracking, and management of the ADM received.

The Discharger currently does not accept hauled-in ADM for direct injection into anaerobic digesters. However, if the Discharger proposes to receive hauled-in ADM for injection into anaerobic digesters for co-digestion, this provision requires the Discharger to notify the Central Valley Water Board and develop and implement SOP's for this activity prior to initiation of the hauling.

#### **6. Other Special Provisions**

- a. The Discharger does not maintain coverage under the State Water Board General Industrial Storm Water Permit. All storm water is directed to the 3 million gallon emergency storm water basin, where it may be routed to the headworks, or left to percolate or evaporate. Any change in storm water discharge location is subject to the requirements of the State Water Board General Industrial Storm Water Permit.

#### **7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable**

### **VII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

CWA section 308 and 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), and 122.48 require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E of this Order, establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this facility.

#### **A. Influent Monitoring**

1. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with effluent limitations (e.g., BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS reduction requirements). Annual monitoring for total recoverable metals has been retained from Order R5-2007-0167. The monitoring frequency for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS has been retained to twice per month to characterize the influent.
2. Order R5-2007-0167 required continuous flow monitoring at Monitoring Location INF-001, defined as the treatment plant headworks. However, the flow measurement device used to measure the influent flow is located between the secondary clarifiers and the ballast pond. Return activated sludge (RAS) flow is removed (by the clarification process) and added prior to the flow meter at a constant rate and, therefore, RAS flow does not

---

<sup>1</sup> CalRecycle has proposed to define "anaerobically digestible material" to include inedible kitchen grease as defined in Food and Agricultural Code section 19216, food material as defined in California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 17852 and vegetative food material.

affect the recorded influent flow reading. Although return flow from the emergency storage basin, filter backwash water, and decant from the biosolids stabilization basins are returned to the headworks and are not measured, the current influent flow location is part of the original plant design and is expected to provide accurate flow measurements for MGD as well as low and peak daily flows. Therefore, this Order moves the monitoring location for flow from Monitoring Location INF-001 to Monitoring Location SEC-001, located between the secondary clarifiers and the ballast pond.

## **B. Effluent Monitoring**

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 CFR 122.44(i)(2) effluent monitoring is required for all constituents with effluent limitations. Effluent monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with effluent limitations, assess the effectiveness of the treatment process, and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream and groundwater.
2. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow (continuous), BOD<sub>5</sub> (weekly), TSS (weekly), pH (daily), chlorodibromomethane (monthly), dichlorobromomethane (monthly), total recoverable zinc (monthly), chlorine residual (continuous), electrical conductivity (monthly), hardness (monthly), orthophosphate (monthly), total phosphorus (monthly), standard minerals (annually), temperature (weekly), total coliform organisms (twice per week), and total dissolved solids (quarterly) have been retained from Order R5-2007-0167 to determine compliance with effluent limitations for these parameters, where applicable, and characterize the effluent.
3. Monitoring data collected during the term of Order R5-2007-0167 for beta-BHC, aluminum, and persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides did not demonstrate reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives/criteria. Thus, specific monitoring requirements for these parameters have not been retained from Order R5 2007-0167.
4. This Order establishes new effluent limitations for copper and nitrate plus nitrite. Therefore, this Order increases the monitoring frequency for total recoverable copper, nitrate, and nitrite from quarterly to monthly to determine compliance with the applicable effluent limitations.
5. This Order increases the effluent monitoring for ammonia from once per month to twice per month to characterize the effluent and to determine compliance with the applicable effluent limitations.
6. This Order includes effluent limitations for diazinon and chlorpyrifos based on the applicable TMDL for the Sacramento and Feather Rivers. Therefore, this Order establishes annual monitoring for diazinon and chlorpyrifos to characterize the effluent and determine compliance with the applicable effluent limitations based on the TMDL.
7. As discussed in section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet, reasonable potential cannot be determined for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate or cadmium. Therefore, this Order requires quarterly monitoring for 2 years for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate and cadmium.
8. In accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring is required for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. This Order requires effluent monitoring for priority pollutants quarterly during the third year of the permit term. See Attachment E, Section IX.C for more detailed requirements related to performing priority pollutant monitoring.
9. California Water Code section 13176, subdivision (a), states: "*The analysis of any material required by [Water Code sections 13000-16104] shall be performed by a laboratory that has accreditation or certification pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 100825) of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 101 of the Health and Safety Code.*"



DPH certifies laboratories through its Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP).

Section 13176 cannot be interpreted in a manner that would violate federal holding time requirements that apply to NPDES permits pursuant to the Clean Water Act. (Wat. Code §§ 13370, subd. (c), 13372, 13377.) Section 13176 is inapplicable to NPDES permits to the extent it is inconsistent with Clean Water Act requirements. (Wat. Code § 13372, subd. (a).) The holding time requirements are 15 minutes for chlorine residual, dissolved oxygen, and pH, and immediate analysis is required for temperature. (40 C.F.R. § 136.3(e), Table II) Due to the location of the Facility, it is both legally and factually impossible for the Discharger to comply with section 13176 for constituents with short holding times.

### **C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements**

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Consistent with Order R5-2007-0167, quarterly 96-hour bioassay testing is required to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity.
2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Consistent with Order R5-2007-0167, annual chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required in order to demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

### **D. Receiving Water Monitoring**

#### **1. Surface Water**

- a. Receiving water monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with receiving water limitations and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream.
- b. **Monitoring Location RSW-001**
  - i. Monitoring frequencies and sample types for hardness (monthly), total dissolved solids (quarterly), ammonia (annually), and standard minerals (annually) have been retained from Order R5-2007-0167.
  - ii. Monitoring frequencies for dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature, have increased from monthly to weekly. Monitoring for electrical conductivity has increased from quarterly to monthly. The increase in monitoring is necessary to better characterize the receiving water and aid in development of site specific ammonia criteria and to determine compliance with permit requirements.
  - iii. Receiving water monitoring for turbidity has not been retained from Order R5-2007-0167. The Facility provides advanced secondary treatment and filters all effluent discharge to surface water, therefore receiving water turbidity monitoring has been removed.
  - iv. Monitoring frequencies for total recoverable zinc and total recoverable copper have increased from quarterly to monthly to assess assimilative capacity in the receiving water for these parameters.
  - v. This Order establishes monthly upstream receiving water monitoring for dissolved copper and dissolved zinc to characterize the dissolved fraction of these metals in the receiving water.
  - vi. Upstream receiving water monitoring requirements for persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides, cadmium, and sulfide have not been retained from Order R5-2007-0167 as monitoring is not necessary to determine compliance with permit requirements.

- vii. In accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. This Order requires monitoring for priority pollutants and other pollutants of concern at Monitoring Location RSW-001 quarterly during the third year of the permit term, concurrent with effluent monitoring, in order to collect data to conduct an RPA for the next permit renewal. See Attachment E, Section IX.C for more detailed requirements related to performing priority pollutant monitoring.

**c. Monitoring Location RSW-002**

- i. Downstream receiving water monitoring and sample types for dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature have been retained from Order R5-2007-0167; however; the frequency of monitoring has increased from monthly to weekly to better characterize the receiving water and to determine compliance with permit requirements.
- ii. Downstream receiving water monitoring total recoverable copper (quarterly), dissolved copper (quarterly), total recoverable zinc (quarterly), and dissolved zinc (quarterly) have not been retained from Order R5-2007-0167 as data is no longer necessary to characterize the dissolved fraction of these metals in the receiving water at this location.
- iii. Downstream receiving water monitoring for turbidity has not been retained from Order R5-2007-0167. The Facility provides advanced secondary treatment and filters all effluent discharge to surface water, therefore receiving water turbidity monitoring has been removed.

**2. Groundwater – Not Applicable**

**E. Other Monitoring Requirements**

**1. Biosolids Monitoring**

Biosolids monitoring is required to ensure compliance with the biosolids disposal requirements contained in the Special Provision contained in section VI.C.5.a. of this Order. Biosolids disposal requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 CFR Part 503 to protect public health and prevent groundwater degradation.

**2. Water Supply Monitoring**

Water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the source of constituents in the wastewater. This Order retains quarterly water supply monitoring for electrical conductivity, and establishes quarterly monitoring for total dissolved solids, standard minerals, copper, and zinc.

**3. Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program**

Under the authority of section 308 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. § 1318), U.S. EPA requires major permittees under the NPDES Program to participate in the annual DMR-QA Study Program. The DMR-QA Study evaluates the analytical ability of laboratories that routinely perform or support self-monitoring analyses required by NPDES permits. There are two options to satisfy the requirements of the DMR-QA Study Program: (1) The Discharger can obtain and analyze a DMR-QA sample as part of the DMR-QA Study; or (2) Per the waiver issued by U.S.EPA to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), the Discharger can submit the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study from their own laboratories or their contract laboratories. A Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study is similar to the DMR-QA Study. Thus,

it also evaluates a laboratory's ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES Program. The Discharger shall submit annually the results of the DMR-QA Study or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to the State Water Board. The State Water Board's Quality Assurance Program Officer will send the DMR-QA Study results or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to U.S. EPA's DMR-QA Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager.

## **VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Central Valley Water Board has considered the issuance of WDR's that will serve as an NPDES permit for the Facility. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Central Valley Water Board staff has developed tentative WDR's and has encouraged public participation in the WDR adoption process.

### **A. Notification of Interested Parties**

The Central Valley Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR's for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through physical posting, mailing, and internet posting.

The public had access to the agenda and any changes in dates and locations through the Central Valley Water Board's website at: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/>

### **B. Written Comments**

Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning tentative WDR's as provided through the notification process. Comments were due either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Central Valley Water Board at the address on the cover page of this Order.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Central Valley Water Board, the written comments were due at the Central Valley Water Board office **by 5:00 p.m. on 13 June 2014.**

### **C. Public Hearing**

The Central Valley Water Board held a public hearing on the tentative WDR's during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: 7/8 August 2014  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Location: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region  
11020 Sun Center Dr., Suite #200  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Central Valley Water Board heard testimony pertinent to the discharge, WDR's, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested in writing.

### **D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements**

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Board to review the decision of the Central Valley Water Board regarding the final WDR's. The petition must be received by the State Water Board at the following address within 30 calendar days of the Central Valley Water Board's action:

State Water Resources Control Board  
Office of Chief Counsel

P.O. Box 100, 1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

For instructions on how to file a petition for review, see  
[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public\\_notices/petitions/water\\_quality/wqpetition\\_instr.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml)

**E. Information and Copying**

The Report of Waste Discharge, other supporting documents, and comments received are on file and may be inspected at the address above at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Central Valley Water Board by calling (916) 464-3291.

**F. Register of Interested Persons**

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDR's and NPDES permit should contact the Central Valley Water Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

**G. Additional Information**

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this order should be directed to Scott Gilbreath at (530) 224-4851.

**ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS**

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Aluminum, Total Recoverable (aquatic life)	µg/L	15.2	n/a	87	750 <sup>1</sup>	87 <sup>2</sup>	--	--	--	--	No
Aluminum, Total Recoverable (human health)	µg/L	15.2 <sup>3</sup>	n/a	200	--	--	--	--	--	200 <sup>4</sup>	No
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.16	0.03	2.14	2.14 <sup>1,5,6</sup>	2.73 <sup>5,7</sup> 6.84 <sup>2,5</sup>	--	--	--	--	Yes <sup>8</sup>
beta-BHC	µg/L	<0.002	<0.002	ND	--	--	0.014	0.046	ND	--	No
Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	2 DNQ	<2	1.8	--	--	1.8	5.9	--	4 <sup>9</sup>	Inconclusive <sup>8</sup>
Cadmium, Total Recoverable	µg/L	0.08 DNQ	2.04	0.22 <sup>10</sup> 0.49 <sup>11</sup>	1.6 <sup>10</sup> 3.2 <sup>12</sup>	1.2 <sup>10</sup> 2.0 <sup>11</sup>	--	--	0.22 <sup>10</sup> 0.49 <sup>11</sup>	5 <sup>9</sup>	Inconclusive <sup>8</sup>
Chloride	mg/L	41	2.4	230	230 <sup>1</sup>	860 <sup>2</sup>	--	--	--	250 <sup>4</sup>	No
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	1.4	<0.06	0.41	--	--	0.41	34	--	80 <sup>13</sup>	Yes (MEC>C)
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	9.9	3.0	5.3 <sup>10,14</sup> 9.1 <sup>11,14</sup>	6.0 <sup>10,15</sup> 11 <sup>11,15</sup>	5.3 <sup>10,14</sup> 9.1 <sup>11,14</sup>	1,300	--	6.0 <sup>10,15</sup> 11 <sup>11,15</sup>	1,000 <sup>4</sup>	Yes (MEC>C)
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	10.7	<0.06	0.56	--	--	0.56	46	--	80 <sup>13</sup>	Yes (MEC>C)
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	474 397 <sup>3</sup>	395 140 <sup>3</sup>	900	--	--	--	--	--	900 <sup>4</sup>	No
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	16.2	n/a	10	--	--	--	--	--	10 <sup>9</sup>	Yes (MEC>C)
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	<0.01	n/a	1	--	--	--	--	--	1 <sup>9</sup>	No
Sulfate, Total (as SO <sub>4</sub> )	mg/L	32.4 <sup>3</sup>	6.31 <sup>3</sup>	250	--	--	--	--	--	250 <sup>4</sup>	No
Sulfide, Total (as S)	mg/L	n/a	<0.01	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	No
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	270 <sup>3</sup>	77 <sup>3</sup>	500	--	--	--	--	--	500 <sup>4</sup>	No
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	101	9.5	23 <sup>10,16</sup> 38 <sup>11,16</sup>	76 <sup>10,16</sup> 131 <sup>11,16</sup>	88 <sup>10,17</sup> 151 <sup>11,17</sup>	--	--	23 <sup>10,16</sup> 38 <sup>11,16</sup>	5,000 <sup>4</sup>	Yes (MEC>C)

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
-------------	-------	-----	---	---	-----	-----	-------------	-----------	------------	-----	----------------------

General Note: All inorganic concentrations are given as a total recoverable.

Data Range: January 2011 through December 2013

MEC = Maximum Effluent Concentration

B = Maximum Receiving Water Concentration or lowest detection level, if non-detect

C = Criterion used for Reasonable Potential Analysis

CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)

CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)

Water & Org = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Water & Organisms (CTR or NTR)

Org. Only = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Organisms Only (CTR or NTR)

Basin Plan = Numeric Site-specific Basin Plan Water Quality Objective

MCL = Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level

n/a = Not Available

ND = Non-detect

DNQ = Detected by laboratory, but not quantified.

Footnotes:

- (1) U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 1-hour average.
- (2) U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 4-day average.
- (3) Represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the MCL.
- (4) Secondary MCL.
- (5) NAWQC 2013 Update – salmonids present, mussels absent
- (6) Determined using pH effluent maximum of 8.5 s.u. and maximum observed effluent temperature of 77.4°F.
- (7) U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 30-day average.
- (8) See section IV.C.3 of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F) for a discussion of the RPA results.
- (9) Primary MCL.
- (10) Criterion to be compared to the maximum upstream receiving water concentration, based on minimum receiving water hardness of 40 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>.
- (11) Criterion to be compared to the MEC, based on minimum effluent hardness of 76 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>.
- (12) Criterion to be compared to the MEC, calculated using Emerick/Pedri Concave Up equation using minimum effluent hardness of 76 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub> and minimum upstream receiving water hardness of 40 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>.
- (13) Represents the Primary MCL for Total Trihalomethanes which include bromoform, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, and dichlorobromomethane.
- (14) Site-specific chronic translator for copper applied: 0.78.
- (15) Site-specific acute translator for copper applied: 0.94.
- (16) Site-specific acute translator for zinc applied: 0.71.
- (17) Site-specific chronic translator for zinc applied: 0.62.

### ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBELS

Parameter	Units	Most Stringent Criteria			Dilution Factors			HH Calculations			Aquatic Life Calculations									Final Effluent Limitations	
		HH	CMC	CCC	HH	CMC	CCC	$ECA_{HH} = \frac{AMEL_{HH}}{MDELEL_{HH}}$	$\frac{AMEL}{MDEL} \text{ Multiplier}_{HH}$	$MDELEL_{HH}$	$ECA \text{ Multiplier}_{acute}$	$LTA_{acute}$	$ECA \text{ Multiplier}_{chronic}$	$LTA_{chronic}$	Lowest LTA	$\frac{AMEL}{MDEL} \text{ Multiplier}_{95}$	$\frac{AMEL}{MDEL}_{AL}$	$\frac{MDEL}{MDELEL}_{99}$	$MDELEL_{AL}$	Lowest AMEL	Lowest MDEL
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/	--	2.14	2.73 <sup>1</sup>	--	9.4	1.6	--	--	--	0.22	4.8	.69	4.8	4.8	1.9	9	4.5	22	9	22
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	--	--	38.8	--	--	14	2	28	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	14	28
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	1000	6.4 <sup>2</sup>	5.6 <sup>3</sup>	--	10.7	10	1000	1.5	1487	0.53	23	0.72	23	23	1.3	29	1.9	43	29	43
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	--	54.8	--	--	26	1.9	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	28	54
Nitrate + Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	10	--	--	3	--	--	40	2.3	93	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	40	--
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	5000	24 <sup>4</sup>	151 <sup>5</sup>	--	10.7	--	5000	1.4	7148	0.57	102	0.75	113	102	1.2	125	1.8	179	125	179

<sup>1</sup> 30-day ammonia criteria.

<sup>2</sup> Basin Plan water quality objective evaluated using a mixed downstream hardness of 43 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and site-specific total to dissolved metal translator of 0.94

<sup>3</sup> Water quality criteria determined using mixed downstream hardness of 43 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and site-specific total to dissolved metal translator of 0.78.

<sup>4</sup> Basin Plan water quality objective evaluated using a mixed downstream hardness of 43 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and site-specific total to dissolved metal translator of 0.71.

<sup>5</sup> Water quality criteria determined using minimum effluent hardness of 76 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and site-specific total to dissolved metal translator of 0.62.